

**SOMES  
PAGES  
ARE TEXT  
DAMAGED**



kansas city



public library

kansas city, missouri

Books will be issued only  
on presentation of library card.  
Please report lost cards and  
change of residence promptly.  
Card holders are responsible for  
all books, records, films, pictures  
or other library materials  
checked out on their cards.

KANSAS CITY, MO. PUBLIC LIBRARY



0 0001 0282106 3

---





THE CHRISTOLOGY  
OF THE APOLOGISTS



# THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE APOLOGISTS

DOCTRINAL

BY

V. A. SPENCE LITTLE

*M.A. (Syd.), B.Litt. (Oxon.)*

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

W. B. SELBIE, D.D.

*Late Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford*

NEW YORK

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

1935



## INTRODUCTION

**M**R. LITTLE has asked me to write a brief introduction to his book and I do so with pleasure. I came into fairly close touch with him during his time in Oxford and learned to admire his industry and scholarly aims. The work which he began then he has carried on in Australia, and it has now borne fruit in this book. The problem with which it deals is one of the utmost importance not only for the history of Christian doctrine but for Christian living. The question "What think ye of Christ?" can never be evaded, and it is always helpful to know what others have thought and said about it. The Christology of the early Fathers, inchoate as it was and remote from our modern ways of thinking, yet set the questions for the future and largely determined the forms of some of the answers. Mr. Little covers a great deal of familiar ground, but does so with a thoroughness and singleness of aim not found in any of the general histories of doctrine. He writes with a practical as well as an academic intention. His book, therefore, fills a gap and is a real contribution to the study of the roots of Christian doctrine.

**KANSAS CITY (MO.) PUBLIC LIBRARY**

W. B. SELBIE.

6814239



## CONTENTS

	PAGE
<i>Introduction</i> . . . . .	5
<i>Preface</i> . . . . .	15

## CHAPTER I

### THE RISE OF THE PNEUMATIC CHRISTOLOGY IN THE SUB-APOSTOLIC AGE

<i>Introductory</i> . . . . .	23
<i>I. The Conception of Pre-Existence</i> . . . . .	28
<i>II. The Sub-Apostolic Christian Writers:</i>	
1. The Epistle of Barnabas . . . . .	34
2. The I Epistle of Clement . . . . .	38
3. The Odes of Solomon . . . . .	42
4. The Ignatian Epistles . . . . .	47
5. The Epistle of Polycarp . . . . .	51
6. The Preaching of Peter . . . . .	53
7. The II Epistle of Clement . . . . .	55
8. The Shepherd of Hermas . . . . .	59
<i>III. Conclusion</i> . . . . .	63

## CHAPTER II

### THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS

<i>Introductory</i> . . . . .	65
<i>I. The Nature of God the Father</i> . . . . .	67



*II. The Christology:*

	PAGE
1. General Observations . . . . .	68
2. The Subordination and Divinity of the Son, the Logos . . . . .	71
3. The Logos, the Creative Agent and Dispensator of the World . . . . .	72
4. The Logos, the Divine Saviour and the Moral Governor . . . . .	73
5. The Son, the Logos, the Revealer of the Father to men . . . . .	73
6. The Logos, the Divine Mediator . . . . .	74

## CHAPTER III

## THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE APOLOGISTS

<i>Introductory</i> . . . . .	76
<i>I. General Observations</i> . . . . .	76
<i>II. The Old Testament and Allegory in the Apologists</i> . . . . .	87

## CHAPTER IV

## THE CHRISTOLOGY OF JUSTIN MARTYR

<i>I. Biographical</i> . . . . .	90
<i>II. Heathen Objections to Christ, the Son of God, and Some Resemblances between Paganism and Christian Doctrine</i> . . . . .	96

<i>III. Christ, the Son of God, the Logos:</i>	PAGE
(a) Christ, "The Son" . . . . .	100
(b) Christ, "The Logos" . . . . .	104
(1) The Generation of the "Logos-Son" . . . . .	108
(2) The Personality of the Logos . . . . .	116
(3) When was Logos Begotten? . . . . .	120
(4) The Pre-Existence of Logos : . . . . .	123
(a) Before Creation . . . . .	124
(b) Subsequent to Creation . . . . .	129
(5) The Logos, the Divine Agent in Creation . . . . .	130
(6) Christ, the Spermatik Logos . . . . .	131
(7) The Many-Named Logos . . . . .	138
<i>IV. Dispensational Christology:</i>	
(a) Christ in Old Testament Prophecy . . . . .	140
(b) Christ, the New Covenant: . . . . .	145
(1) The Redemptional Dispensation . . . . .	146
(2) The Gubernatorial Dispensation . . . . .	149
<i>V. The Incarnation and Earthly Life of Christ</i>	150
<i>VI. The Divinity and Subordination of Christ</i>	159
<i>VII. Christ, the World-Power, the Conqueror of     Demons, and the Saviour</i> . . . . .	172
<i>Conclusion</i> . . . . .	174

## CHAPTER V

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF TATIAN, THEOPHILUS, AND  
ATHENAGORAS*The Christology of Tatian*

<i>I. Biographical</i> . . . . .	177
<i>II. The Relation of the Internal Logos to the Father</i>	182

<i>III. The Logos Hypostatic:</i>	PAGE
(a) His Generation or Utterance . . . . .	183
(b) His Activities . . . . .	188
(c) His Personality. . . . .	189
<i>IV. The Subordination of the Logos . . . . .</i>	190
<i>V. The Logos and the Earthly Life of Christ . . . . .</i>	192
<i>VI. Conclusion . . . . .</i>	193

### *The Christology of Theophilus*

<i>I. Biographical . . . . .</i>	193
<i>II. The Divine Trinity and the Logos . . . . .</i>	197
<i>III. The Relation between the Logos and the         Wisdom of God . . . . .</i>	198
<i>IV. The Logos Internal . . . . .</i>	199
<i>V. The Logos Uttered :</i>	
(1) The Generation or Utterance of the Logos . . . . .	201
(2) The Activities of the Logos :	
(a) The Creative Agent . . . . .	203
(b) The Administrator of the Universe . . . . .	204
(c) The Saviour of Men . . . . .	205
(d) The Many-Named Logos . . . . .	205
(3) When was the Logos Generated ? . . . . .	206
<i>VI. The Subordination of the Logos and His         Relation to the Father . . . . .</i>	207
<i>VII. The Personality of the Logos . . . . .</i>	209
<i>VIII. The Divinity of the Logos . . . . .</i>	209

# Contents II

## *The Christology of Athenagoras* PAGE

<i>I. Biographical</i> . . . . .	210
<i>II. The Divine Trinity and the Logos</i> . . . . .	214
<i>III. The Logos Internal</i> . . . . .	217
<i>IV. The Logos "in Procession"</i> . . . . .	218
<i>V. The Logos as the Creative Agent and the Mediator</i> . . . . .	221
<i>VI. The Subordination of the Logos and His Relation to the Father</i> . . . . .	224
<i>VII. The Divinity and the Nature of the Logos</i> . . . . .	226
<i>Bibliography</i> . . . . .	229
<i>Index</i> . . . . .	237



## THE WORKS OF THE APOLOGISTS

(WITH ABBREVIATIONS)

The following abbreviations in the footnotes refer to the works enumerated below:—

I *Apol.*—The First Apology of Justin Martyr.

II *Apol.*—The Second Apology of Justin Martyr.

*Dial.*—Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho the Jew.

*Tat.*—Tatian's *Oratio*, or Address to the Greeks.

*Theoph.* I.—The First Book of the *Ad Autolycum* of Theophilus.

*Theoph.* II.—The Second Book of the *Ad Autolycum* of Theophilus.

*Theoph.* III.—The Third Book of the *Ad Autolycum* of Theophilus.

*Athenag.*—The *Supplicatio*, or Plea for the Christians, by Athenagoras.

(The numerals indicate chapters and pages in these works, according to Otto's edition of the text.)

*H.D.B.*—Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible.

*Encl. Brit.*—Encyclopædia Britannica.



## PREFACE

THE account of the Christology of the Apologists presented in this volume is a result of an investigation of the works of these writers in the light of the current religious philosophy of the Graeco-Roman world and earlier Christian teaching. Careful inquiry was made into all elements of the pagan religious philosophy which could have influenced the form of expression adopted by the Apologists in stating their doctrines.<sup>1</sup> Thereby, I believe, the more exact interpretation of the teaching of these writers was much facilitated; for I became aware that by no other method could results be attained at once correct, adequate, and suitable.

May I hope that this book may prove of some small help to students interested in the early history of the Person of Christ, in drawing attention, as it does, to an earlier stage in the development of that form of doctrinal statement which, in course of time, was to become incorporated in the Nicene Symbol.

The Christology is herein treated analytically, each individual element being taken up and discussed under a sub-head, the relationship of each to other elements, and also to the whole, being indicated.

All the Apologists, broadly speaking, teach the same



doctrine of the Person of Christ, but since Justin presents a more detailed version, his account has been set forth in some fullness, being the most representative in type. The discussion of the teaching of the remaining Apologists is intended to be read as in comparison with Justin's.

Preceding the treatment of the Apologists will be found a section dealing with the Sub-Apostolic writers whose works give a version of Christology as they knew it. For, it is interesting to observe that in these writers, in all probability, we have before us those very elements which were the materials upon which the Apologists worked in order to produce their more finished product.

Again, in the Epistle to Diognetus, Christology appears to have attained to an intermediate stage, being an advance upon the simpler forms found in the Sub-Apostolic writers, but, however, not so scholastic as that of the Apologists.

A reader of the Apologists cannot but be struck with the remarkable difference between the forms in which they state Christian doctrine and the general phraseology of the New Testament. This change in form of expression can be historically accounted for by the new environment into which the Christian message was carried and amid which ecclesiastical life was developed. As a natural consequence of its spread into the pagan society of the period, Christianity responded to its new surroundings by adapting the

terminology used in its preaching to the Gentile modes of thought. Graeco-Roman thoughts and words were taken up and incorporated in the missionary propaganda. For Christian writings show that Christianity became more and more identified with and interpreted by the Hellenistic spirit—an element which made its appearance in Christian doctrine first in the New Testament. Henceforth, all subsequent development in dogma was to be determined by the conditions of Greek culture. But, further, the Apologists had all been trained in the philosophical schools. What, then, could be more natural than that these men should express their Christian belief after the manner of the schools in which they had been educated? But they never seem to have suspected that in so doing they had caused the simple evangelical message to approximate, in language at least, to the scholasticism of the time. However, no evidence can be adduced that there existed any intention on the part of any one of the Apologists to give to Christian teaching a philosophical form. On the contrary, indeed, these writers insist that they are merely setting forth the pure Christian doctrine which was inherited from the Apostles.

In stating their teaching upon the Person of Christ the Apologists make use of many philosophical terms and phrases, the most prominent amongst them being the term “Logos.” This term, which in Christian circles had formerly stood merely for the Word of

God, when transferred to the Hellenistic environment came to bear such meanings as the Divine Reason, the Divine Potency, the Idea of Ideas, the Mind and Understanding of the Supreme God, though at the same time it represented the Man, Christ Jesus, Who is God the Son, Incarnated and made Man. That the Son of God of the New Testament could be designated by Christians as the Divine Reason of the philosophers indicates that a great change had taken place, at least, in the form of statement of the doctrine—a difference which may be characterized as a change from the primitive, naïve, unreflective, to the systematic, scientific, reflective type of thought, reminiscent of the philosophic schools. Christian thought had travelled far, and in its journey had learned a new mode of speech.

However, philosophy, with the Apologists, is never the substitute for Christian doctrine. Nor does it ever determine their doctrines, but rather their doctrines determine the use they make of philosophy.

It will be of interest to note, especially in connection with modern critical discussion, that the Apologists, as early witnesses to the fact of Jesus Christ, God the Son of Christian experience, maintain in most absolute terms, His actual Deity. And they also give to the Holy Spirit His rightful place in the Godhead. Again, there appears to be no evidence whatever in the Apologists to support the suggestion that any of the basic elements of Christian belief were the result of an

evolutionary development from pagan mystical conceptions in conjunction with Christian teaching. In fact, certain pagan notions which bear a superficial resemblance to Christian belief in Jesus Christ, as God become Man, the Apologists, in clear and considered language, describe as mere travesties of Christian truth. Further, the Apologists claim that it is not they who have been deceived as to their religious belief, but that the pagan world was made the victim of devilish and untrue doctrines. So thoroughly convinced are these intelligent, educated men—men also closely in touch with the practical life of their day—that Jesus Christ is actually and simply God Incarnate, the Son of God, that they defy all challenges of their opponents to the contrary.

The charge sometimes made against the Apologists that they corrupted Christian doctrine appears to be neither just nor capable of proof, in view of their simple, earnest, evangelical faith. Obviously, for what transpired a century or more later in connection with the further development of Christology, neither these Apologists nor their methods can reasonably be blamed. But, on the other hand, due recognition should be accorded to the great and peculiar service they rendered to Christianity. For, be it remembered that amid the growing ferment of Gnosticism, these men effectively defended Christian truth by presenting it in the accepted scientific forms of thought, and set it upon a rational basis from which none of the

arguments of their opponents could dislodge it. To their faults and deficiencies it behoves us to extend a kindly judgment, and generously to grant them all the honour they deserve, in consideration for their valuable services to Christian thought.

A conspicuous feature of the Apologetic Christology is the Logos Doctrine, or theory of Divine Intermediation. This was modelled upon the Logos Doctrine of the Hellenistic philosophy. For the philosophers the task was to find a rational explanation as to how the Transcendent God could be in active connexion with the generated world. It was a difficult and baffling problem. For the elements of religious dualism, spirit and matter, had been so emphasized that God had been placed beyond all knowledge by man, in absolute isolation, the Unknown and Unknowable. But devout men knew from their experience that some connexion between God and the world did exist. Consequently, in response to the intense religious feeling of the age, the rigid theories of the past were modified, and in the spiritual Eclecticism of the time, Transcendence and Immanence tended to become combined in a simple unified conception of Deity. In the Alexandrian philosophy a combination of these two elements had already taken place, and a similar movement was in progress during the first and second centuries in Hellenic thought. There was then evolved the conception of an Intermediary Divine Being, identical with the Supreme in essence, yet in dynamic relation

with the generated world, who expressed the Divine will in the Creation, and continued to act as the Divine Agent in the administration of the universe. This Being was variously designated the Idea of Ideas, the First Principle, the Divine Potency, the Second God, or the Logos, according to the philosophical prepossessions of the writers. It was this Logos of the philosophers which was taken up into Christian theology and made to represent the historical Jesus Christ, God's Son, and was so employed in the writings of the Apologists.

Careful references have been supplied, so that passages quoted from writers consulted may be verified by readers who desire to do so.

And, finally, I wish to express thanks to the Rev. W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D., late Principal of Mansfield College, and Professor J. Vernon Bartlet, M.A., D.D., Mansfield College, for help and guidance in the preparation of the theological part of the work.

V. A. S. LITTLE.

Sydney, N.S.W.

July 1933.

<sup>1</sup> The results of the enquiry into pagan philosophy referred to on p. 15 are included in another volume companion to the present.



## CHAPTER I

### THE RISE OF THE PNEUMATIC CHRISTOLOGY IN THE SUB-APOSTOLIC AGE

#### INTRODUCTORY

CHRISTIANITY early became a living organism. Its vitality manifested itself in a growing organization and in the gradual systematization of doctrinal material. A prominent feature of the Church of the first generation of Christians was its Judaism, which was manifested in part by the Messianic character attributed to Christ. But toward the end of Apostolic times, these primitive views of Christ tended to give place to more complex, reflective opinions. Christ, identified as the Messiah of Jewish prophecy, sounded well in a community of Jewish Christians, but this rather limited definition of the Saviour was soon required to yield to one capable of more general acceptance, such as could indicate both to Jews and Gentiles the common Saviour, Whom the preaching of the Apostles had confidently announced.

Amidst the variety of opinions held by early Christians upon the Person and character of Jesus Christ, two distinct lines of thought stand out with prominence. We refer to those views which in



modern times have become known as the Adoptionist and the Pneumatic theories.

#### ADOPTIONIST VIEWS

Speculation of the Adoptionist type conceived Jesus Christ to be a man of marvellous virtue, whose superlative spirituality had been such as to constitute him a fitting vehicle for the revelation of God's purpose to save the world. That is to say, God adopted Him as His unique Son, and added to His human personality an unmeasured endowment of the Divine Spirit. Theorists of this persuasion went even so far as to select the occasion upon which this investment with the Divine Spirit took place, when, in the words of the Gospel to the Hebrews—"the whole fount of the Holy Spirit descended and rested upon Him," and thereby the Divine Spirit became fully incarnated.

#### COMPARED WITH PAULINE DOCTRINE

Apart from the mechanical relationship suggested by the Adoptionist theory, the known frailty of human nature itself caused that theory, in the view of a deep, devout, speculative mind, to appear artificial and problematical. The Apostolic preaching had claimed that Jesus Christ had lived a moral life of a quality which no other man had attained. St. Paul reflected that Jesus, called Christ, was apart from other men, not only in the perfect righteousness

of His life, but also in a certain more essential and absolute sense. In a word, Jesus was that Divine Person Who pre-existed this earthly life, dwelling with the Father above in heavenly places, and Who came to this world in order to assume the flesh at His Father's bidding. Thus, as a necessity of thought, St. Paul was persuaded of the existence of a transcendent element in Christ's personality which both differentiated Him from all other men, and made it possible to conceive of Him as that "last Adam" Who was "of heaven"—a quickening Spirit.

#### PNEUMATIC CHRISTOLOGY

From presuppositions such as these, the Pneumatic theory of the Person of Christ arose, which assumed that the Son of God incarnate was the visible embodiment of the Divine Spiritual Being, or *Pneuma*, the next in order of being and dignity to the Eternal Father, and, that, possessing in Himself all the Divine Essence, He descended from above, and became the historical Jesus Christ, by being born in the human sense and thereby incarnated. The Pneumatic view of the Person of Christ, through its intrinsic qualities, is found identified with the highest spiritual development in early Christianity, and continually shows its capacity to inspire the early Church with larger visions of the truth.

Whilst each of these theories recognized Jesus as the Divine Lord of the world, of Messianic dignity

and equal in honour with the Deity, the Pneumatic view found the union of the Divine and human in the actual Incarnation as such.

#### PNEUMATIC CHRISTOLOGY PREVAILS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Both these types of Christological thought referred to above, which appeared here in a simple form, and there in a somewhat more developed form, were evolved out of materials contained in the New Testament.<sup>1</sup> Without attempting to discuss the Christology of the New Testament, it may be said that in the Epistles and in the Fourth Gospel, which show primitive Christianity in a reflective stage, the Pneumatic type of thought predominates. Primitive Christianity rose no higher in its conceptions of the Person of Christ than is indicated by those majestic periods which open the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel. Though the terms and forms of expression appear to have affinity with the religious thought of the Hellenistic schools of the time, the probability is that the writer is merely expressing, in such intellectual forms as would be suitable to the Gentile world, those views of Christ to which he had been led by his experience of Him in the inner life. To the writer of the Fourth Gospel, no Being who was not essentially and absolutely Divine could have lived as Christ lived and have continued to be the Upholder and

<sup>1</sup> A general reference to Harnack. *Dogma*, vol. I, p. 190, *seq.*

Inspirer of the Church on earth. Consequently, he concluded, that the Word Who had become flesh was the Same as was "In the Beginning," "with God," and Who "was God."

The above theories of the Person of Christ continued a parallel existence throughout the Sub-Apostolic Age. Both are of interest to our inquiry, the first by contrast to the other, the second as an anticipation of the Logos Doctrine, of which it was, in a sense, the preparatory stage.

#### SUB-APOSTOLIC WRITINGS

The interesting task will shortly occupy our attention of examining certain writings of the Sub-Apostolic Age which present features of the Pneumatic theory in its process of growth down to the time of the second-century Apologists. The documents referred to include (1) The Epistle of Barnabas, (2) The First Epistle of Clement, (3) The Odes of Solomon, (4) The Epistles of Ignatius, (5) The Epistle of Polycarp, (6) The Preaching of Peter, (7) The Second Epistle of Clement, and (8) The Shepherd of Hermas. These writers represent a period of transition. What speculative elements are contained in their doctrinal teaching cannot be said to be due to intentional speculation; nor are their rudimentary attempts at systematization of doctrine a result of set purpose to comprise all Christian doctrine in one homogeneous system. Both their language and terminology are

seen to be yet in a somewhat fluid state, though tending to become fixed; consequently, we shall meet with varying uses of terms and an uncertainty in the setting forth of some items of doctrine. However, all these writers are thinkers. Without perceiving the full purport of their opinions, they advanced the development of certain elements of doctrine, at least a step. Thus, in studying their writings, it will be possible to observe the actual growth of that type of speculative thought upon the Person of Christ which, in course of time, was to become dominant in Christian theology, and to include as its most important philosophical element, the Logos Doctrine.

### I—THE CONCEPTION OF PRE-EXISTENCE

Before examining the writings just referred to, may we stay a moment to outline in brief some aspects of the doctrine of Pre-Existence,<sup>1</sup> which is a necessary presupposition of the Pneumatic theory of the Person of Christ. Since the two systems of thought principally contributing to the formulation of early ecclesiastical teaching were the Jewish and the Hellenic, a short outline of the conception of Pre-Existence in each will be helpful.

#### IN JUDAISM

The notion of Pre-Existence appears to be scarcely known in the ancient religion, only a few passages in

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Harnack, *loc. cit.*, *sup.*

the Old Testament (and some of these debatable) seeming to touch upon the subject.<sup>1</sup> But some time prior to the advent of Christ this hypothesis underwent considerable development, especially in the Apocalyptic and Rabbinic literature.<sup>2</sup> All that is good and perfect, these writers taught, could come only from above, where it had existed from all eternity. Everything bearing spiritual significance on earth was supposed to have had previous existence in heaven. And its appearance on earth was regarded as but the materialization of its former spiritual existence above. But earthly form did not involve any essential change, nor any diminution of its spiritual nature ; the only change conceivable being the substitution of the material form for the original spiritual form. For instance, the Law<sup>3</sup> came down from heaven and took earthly form from its being engraved on tables by the finger of God ; the Tabernacle on earth<sup>4</sup> was the visible form of the heavenly Tabernacle ; Jerusalem was the anti-type of the already existing New Jerusalem<sup>5</sup> above, which, at the consummation of all things, was to descend in place of the old ; children had their " angels " in heaven,

<sup>1</sup> Art., J. T. Marshall, *H.D.B.*

<sup>2</sup> Art., R. Law, *H.D. Apos. Church*. Pre-existence of souls—Wisdom of Solomon, viii, 20 ; " Yea, rather, being good I came into a body undefiled."

<sup>3</sup> Exodus, xxxi, 18 ; xxxii, 16. See Art. *H.D. Apos. Ch.* Midrash on Psalm 8.

<sup>4</sup> Ex., xxv, 9.

<sup>5</sup> Gal., iv, 26, a conspicuous item in Apocalyptic.

who ever beheld the face of the Heavenly Father<sup>1</sup>; and the Messiah, chosen by God from eternity, was already in heaven<sup>2</sup> in communion with God.

### IN HELLENISM

The Hellenic conception was somewhat different, of which a classic instance is presented in the Platonic doctrine of Ideas. Every earthly object had its anti-type in an eternal Idea or Form,<sup>3</sup> of which the former was the imperfect material copy. The notions of Idea and copy, the original pattern and its imitation, figured the hard opposition between spirit and matter, infinite and finite, of Greek dualism. The same dualism was represented in universal terms as the contrast between the Intelligible world and the sensible world, the former answering to the Jewish notion of "heaven." In Plato's *Timaeus* the Demiurge forms the universe "looking to the eternal" models in the Intelligible world. Thus, to a Platonist, the created world, including all its complexity and manifoldness, was but the copy of the perfect or Ideal world existing in the heavens. As to conscious existences in the Ideal world, Greeks imagined various orders<sup>4</sup> of gods, daemons, heroes, etc., a belief which received vast development from about the time of the Advent onwards. But all these heavenly beings were

<sup>1</sup> Matt., xviii, 10.

<sup>2</sup> II Esdras, xii, 32; xiii, 26; cf. Enoch, 48, 6, etc.

<sup>3</sup> ἰδέα, μῦγμα.

<sup>4</sup> As in Plutarch, Maximus of Tyre, etc.

devoid of permanent material bodies. Whenever the religious myths recorded a divine appearance on earth, that appearance took place in a "body" of human form assumed but temporarily. While this conception recognized an intercourse between earth and heaven, it implied a temporary limitation, and, in a sense, a degradation, of the heavenly, by contact with matter. Celsus,<sup>1</sup> writing about the year A.D. 170, refers to this very point in denying the possibility of the appearance of the Son of God on earth. For limitation and degradation involved change. But Greek theology held God to be unchangeable. In consequence, a heavenly being which took earthly form could not be essentially divine, like the Deity. However, the attribution of a heavenly pre-existence to any object or person enhanced the importance of such, and prepared the way for its veneration and worship.

#### A PHILOSOPHICAL VERSION

The incident of the contact of these two theories is historically visible in the Judaeo-Alexandrian philosophical literature, and in portion of the Old Testa-

<sup>1</sup> *True Word*, iv, 2; ii, 31. He argues that a descent of God to earth would involve change, whilst the divine nature is immutable. If then, Christians assert that God changed into a mortal body, He did not really change, but caused spectators to fancy that He did. A descent of God to earth is disproved by consideration of God's relations to matter. Christians would impose on the Logos the limitations of human personality, as well as associate Divinity with base matter (iv, 18, 20, 52; iii, 41, 42; vi, 19).



ment Apocrypha.<sup>1</sup> Philo Judaeus could see in the first verse of Genesis an "intelligible" world called heaven, and a "phenomenal" world, the earth.<sup>2</sup> But this was to read into the simple narrative of Genesis, the Platonic theory of Ideas. In many other applications of the theory of the original and copy, the Greek view of the inferiority of the copy was prominent.

### JEWISH VIEWS OF MESSIAH

Through certain political events in Judaism, thought had been directed to a theocratic state, of which the Messiah of prophecy would be the heavenly King. Hellenistic Jews<sup>3</sup> had anticipated that the Messiah would be a Man, very exalted and of great dignity, and that his appearance in the flesh would be only another form of his pre-mundane existence<sup>4</sup> with God. That is to say, His appearance on earth would not involve Incarnation truly, and neither a humiliation nor an essential limitation.

Whilst Jesus was hailed as Messiah by Christians, the very facts of His life appeared to contradict the Jewish theory of the Pre-Existence, and to favour the Hellenic. For He was despised, a suffering Messiah,

<sup>1</sup> Philo, and Wisdom of Sol.

<sup>2</sup> *de Opif. Mundi*, 6.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Trypho in Justin's *Dial.*, 36, 49, etc.; cf. Esdras, vii, 29.

<sup>4</sup> This was the belief of Rabbinic schools, though the pre-mundane existence of Messiah was only ideal (R. Law, *H.D.*, Apos. Church).

Bp. Gore (*Belief in Christ*, 1922, p. 30, note), states that except in the Sibylline oracles, there is no trace of Jewish belief in the Pre-Existence of Messiah. Evidently opinion differs on this matter.

submissive to human authority, and even to death. It was plainly thus not the case of the Glory of the heavenly being appearing in Him with fullness on earth, but an instance of veritable limitation, a degradation, a surrendering of portion of His heavenly power and qualities, in some sense. But early Christians supposed that, after the Ascension, Christ's faithfulness having been recognized by God, He now "sitteth on the right hand of God" in glory—a recompense for His earthly humiliation.

#### INCREASING INFLUENCE OF HELLENIC VIEWS

In proportion as Christianity became Hellenized, Jewish views gave place to Hellenic, though, as a whole, the two are found contemporary with each other. From Alexandria, Hellenistic influence upon the conception of Pre-Existence flows more strongly from the beginning of the second century, and forms a noticeable feature in certain of the Sub-Apostolic writings, e.g., in Barnabas Ep., Ignatius Epp., and in II Clement Ep. Its most complete statement may be gathered in the sentence—"Christ the Lord, Who saved us, being originally Spirit, and the First Principle of every creature, became flesh, and so called us."<sup>1</sup> Referring to these propositions Harnack remarks, "This is the fundamental theological and philosophical creed on which the whole Trinitarian

<sup>1</sup> Harnack, *Dogma*, vol. I, p. 238, E.T.; cf. II Clem., ix, 5; Barn. Ep., xii, 5.

and Christological speculations of the Church of succeeding centuries are built; and it is this which is the root of the orthodox system of dogmatics. . . . For the notion that Christ was ἀρχή πάσης κτίσεως, necessarily led in some measure to the conception of Christ as Logos. For the Logos had been long regarded as the Beginning and Principle of Creation.”

We now proceed to trace the Pneumatic hypothesis in the Sub-Apostolic writings mentioned above.

## II—THE SUB-APOSTOLIC CHRISTIAN WRITERS

1. The Epistle of Barnabas.
2. The I Epistle of Clement.
3. The Odes of Solomon.
4. The Epistles of Ignatius.
5. The Epistle of Polycarp.
6. The Preaching of Peter.
7. The II Epistle of Clement.
8. The Shepherd of Hermas.

### I.—*The Epistle of Barnabas*

The best critical authorities place the date<sup>1</sup> of this Epistle at about the end of the first century or near the beginning of the second. As to authorship, nothing is known; the only critical agreement reached

<sup>1</sup> Cunningham (Ep. Barnabas) gives the date as A.D. 79; Lightfoot suggests 70–79; Ramsay (*Ch. in Rom. Empire*) thinks that part of the Epistle could have been written in Vespasian's time, though judging from passages referring to persecutions, he would date it A.D. 100–132; and Hort, A.D. 117. We incline to A.D. 79.

up to the present on this point denies its authorship to Barnabas. Its provenance is generally considered to be Alexandria. Hence, it would shed light upon the contemporary Christianity in that great centre, and inform us as to the "influence to which it was subjected."

### ITS TYPE OF THOUGHT

The Epistle belongs to a type of thought different from the Pauline Epistles, and appears to have affinity in its innermost sphere of thought (Keim) with the Fourth Gospel, though actual traces of that Gospel are not certain. While it does not seem to depend upon St. John, Cunningham believes it was written "under similar pressure of external conditions." Though Barnabas contains a large element of allegory and has frequent references to the gnosis, it cannot be regarded as a characteristic gnostic writing. Still its gnostic elements have had an influence upon the form of its Christology, and are manifested in a certain Doketic tendency in the views expressed upon the Person of Christ. As a consequence, the author exhibits a greater readiness to refer to Christ as a personal Spirit than to represent Him as Incarnated—which is not surprising in one living, as we presume, amid incipient Gnosticism.

### VIEWS ON CHRIST'S BODY

The same cause, doubtless, led the writer to be rather lax in his appreciation of the relations between

spirit and matter. The "body" of Christ he considers to be but a "form"<sup>1</sup> to veil the Spirit, stating that "He is not the Son of Man, but the Son of God, manifested in the flesh as in a type."<sup>2</sup> And again, the Lord "in His own Person was about to offer the vessel of the Spirit as a sacrifice for our sins."<sup>3</sup> Jesus is pre-eminently the "Son of God,"<sup>4</sup> and Barnabas keenly appreciates the contrast between the splendour which is His as God's Son, and the humiliation of the fleshly life.

#### CHRIST IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Christ's Sonship he considers as existing prior, not only to the Incarnation, but even to the Creation. For, relying upon the allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament, he can believe that at Creation the words "Let us make man" were addressed by God to His Son, with Whom He consults, viz. "He is Lord of all the world, to Whom God said, before the foundation of the world, Let us make man, etc."<sup>5</sup> So that, before Creation, Christ is potentially Lord of all the world—a divine Spiritual Person. In a subsequent passage, Barnabas refers again to the same text in Genesis, and adds—"These things were spoken to the Son."<sup>6</sup> The allegorical method of

<sup>1</sup> τύπος.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. Barn. 12:10.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 7:3.

<sup>4</sup> 12:10, 15:11, 15:5, etc. "The Lord of the whole world," 5:5, "Creator," etc.

<sup>5</sup> 5:5, cf. Justin, *Dial.*, 62; *Theoph.* II, 18. Philo writes similarly of his Logos.

<sup>6</sup> 6:12.

interpretation also enables the author to see "types of Christ" in certain Old Testament passages, e.g., the Brazen Serpent declares the glory of Christ; Moses is a type of the Christ "not as Son of Man but as Son of God"; and Joshua is also a "type"<sup>1</sup> in a similar sense. In associating Christ with the Old Testament history, Barnabas represents Him as occupying the position of the ever-present Arbiter of history, God's Vice-Gerent and Pre-Existent Son. In this capacity He is represented as the Spirit Who inspires the prophets,<sup>2</sup> and Barnabas states that in Him are fulfilled certain prophecies of the Psalms and Isaiah, "for in Him are all things."<sup>3</sup>

#### CHRIST MANIFESTED BY THE INCARNATION

Christ being already Son of God before the Incarnation, it is by the Incarnation He manifested Himself as such.<sup>4</sup> So exalted, or, to give Him the gnostic or doketic significance, so essentially spiritual is He, that the writer of Barnabas makes certain deific scriptural passages apply to Christ, viz.: "David himself prophesies . . . the Lord said to Christ my Lord, Whose hand I held, etc." He then adds—"See how David calls Him Lord, and does not say Son."<sup>5</sup> These scriptural references invest the Son with a

<sup>1</sup> 12:7 and 12:10.

<sup>2</sup> 5:6, 5:14.

<sup>3</sup> 12:7; cf. Coloss. Ep., i, 16; cf. *Athenag.*, *Supplic.* 10:10.c. Justin frequently represents Christ as appearing in the course of O.T. history (see p. 140, *seq.*)

<sup>4</sup> 5:9, 5:11.

<sup>5</sup> 12:10; ref. Psalm 110.

dignity entirely divine, in fact, set Him upon the same level as Deity itself—for God's acts are identified as those of Christ.

## CONCLUSION

The cumulative force of the passages cited above leaves no doubt that the writer of Barnabas conceived Jesus as the pre-existent Son of God, possessing personal life even before the Creation as the Divine Spiritual Son, of Whom the Incarnation was but the visible, though partial, manifestation.

### 2.—*I Clement Epistle*

In this Epistle, which was written from Rome to the Corinthian Church about the last decade of the first century,<sup>1</sup> is discernible not only a genuine Christian faith, but some appreciation of the centrality and basic importance of Jesus Christ as God's Son. But herein we shall not find much theoretical statement upon the Person of Christ, since Clement's mind is less speculative than practical, and finds interest rather in Christ's work.

## VIEWS ON CHRIST

However, he implies<sup>2</sup> that Jesus is more than a man "after the flesh," for in His nature resides a higher element, which is the object of worship by believers.

<sup>1</sup> A.D. 95-96—Lightfoot and others—Ramsay, W. M. (*op. cit.*, p. 300) dates it in A.D. 97.

<sup>2</sup> Ch. 32—*κατά σαρκά*.

And Clement exhorts his readers thus—"Let us fix our gaze upon the blood of Christ . . . because it was poured out for our salvation,"<sup>1</sup> and states also "He is the High Priest of our offerings, the Guardian of our souls."<sup>2</sup>

#### OLD TESTAMENT INTERPRETED

Then again, Christ is that One in the Old Testament called God's "Servant" (the prophetic term being applied to Him), viz.—"that the Creator of the universe may guard by His beloved Child."<sup>3</sup> In these words, Clement connects Christ with the divine Dispensation of the Old Testament revelation. His dignity is signified further by the words of the Doxology,<sup>4</sup> viz.: "Through our Lord Jesus Christ, to Whom be glory and majesty<sup>5</sup> for ever and ever." Several other doxologies occur<sup>6</sup> in one of which Christ's dignity is such as to admit of His being made the channel by which worship is conveyed to God, viz.: "through Whom (i.e., Christ) be to God, glory and honour and majesty and might and dominion, for ever and ever."<sup>7</sup>

#### HIGHER VIEWS OF CHRIST'S NATURE

The statements above may be taken as the groundwork for more exalted views of Christ's Person, to

<sup>1</sup> Ch. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Ch. 61.

<sup>3</sup> *παιδὸς αὐτοῦ*—59:2.

<sup>4</sup> Ch. 20:11-12; 50:7.

<sup>5</sup> *doxa, megalosunes.*

<sup>6</sup> E.g., 39:4, 58:2, 61:3.

<sup>7</sup> 65:2.



which Clement rises. For such is the nature of the Son, that the life which is in Christ is regarded as being of the same purity as God's, viz.: "as God lives and the Lord Jesus Christ lives,"<sup>1</sup> etc. So that what is true of the life of One is true also of the Other, and the life that is in God is viewed as a pledge to certify that the same life is in Christ. Clement elevates Christ above the highest Angels—those higher spiritual creatures between whom and God there was formerly supposed to exist no other Being.

#### CHRIST'S PRE-EXISTENCE

In support of this magnification, he quotes from the Epistle to Hebrews,<sup>2</sup> wherein is described the great splendour and majesty of Him Who was born God's Son—"the effulgence of the Glory" of God. Clement believes that "Jesus Christ was sent from God,"<sup>3</sup> and that He "came" to earth, i.e., in the flesh—in humility, though He could have chosen to come in glory.<sup>4</sup> From these two passages, it is to be inferred that Christ existed as a veritable Person before the Incarnation, and as such possessed the personal prerogative of choice of action; and, further, that He could not have been merely a creature, nor have originated actually at the Incarnation.

Christ's spiritual pre-existence is to be gathered also from the writer's reference to Him as the Inspirer

<sup>1</sup> 58:2.

<sup>3</sup> 42:2.

<sup>2</sup> 36:2—in Ep. to Heb., i, 3, *seq.*

<sup>4</sup> 16:2-3; cf. Philippians Ep., ii, 5.

of Scripture, viz.: "He (Christ) exhorts by the Holy Ghost, etc.,"<sup>1</sup> which he illustrates by a quotation from the Psalms. This practice of connecting Christ with the prophetic dispensation is seen to be common amongst early Christians.<sup>2</sup> While it adds weight to Christ's utterances in the New Testament, it also testifies that He was considered to possess an active personal life, at least prior to His Incarnation. In one passage Clement even seems to assert that Christ is God.<sup>3</sup> But several commentators<sup>4</sup> doubt that the reference is to Christ's Divinity. Admittedly, as a basis for argument, the passage cannot be urged.

### IS CHRIST THE LOGOS?

Though the term "Logos" does not occur with an undoubted Christological significance, his acceptance of the passage from Hebrews Epist. referred to above intimates that Clement regarded Christ as possessing at least the characteristics of the Logos. However, he does once appear to speak of Him as the Logos, viz.: "In the Word<sup>5</sup> of His Majesty, He (God) established all things." In view of the tendency to personification of religious notions in the first two centuries, it is permissible to regard this as a reference

<sup>1</sup> 22:1.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Barn. Ep., 5:6; Justin, Theophilus, etc.

<sup>3</sup> Chap. II, *παθήματα αὐτοῦ*, i.e., *Θεοῦ*, which is read by Lightfoot and Harnack, but *Χριστοῦ* by other editors.

<sup>4</sup> Dorner, *Person of Ch.*; Pfeiderer, *Prim. Christianity*.

<sup>5</sup> 27:4.

to the personal Logos-Christ. Dorner favours this view, and states "it would then appear that the creative divine Word was personified exactly after the theologoumena of the period. Another and particularly forcible reason is the relation of our author to the Epp. of St. Paul and the Ep. to Hebrews, in both of which the Pre-Existent Son is not only taught, but is brought into connection with Creation" (cf. Heb. i, 3, iv, 12; Col. i, 17<sup>1</sup>).

In opposition to Dorner, Gebhardt-Harnack state, "Sed hoc non satis firmum est; pugnare enim videtur cum sequentibus."<sup>2</sup> However, since Clement is a follower of St. Paul, and also quotes Hebrews with approval, we consider the opinion expressed above to be sufficiently supported.

### 3.—*The Odes of Solomon*

#### CRITICAL OPINIONS

Though the date of these writings cannot be fixed with precision, adequate evidence is forthcoming to ensure them a place within the period from A.D. 73 to 190. Dr. Rendel Harris<sup>3</sup> considers that should Ode IV refer to the Temple at Leontopolis, the date of that Ode would be perhaps A.D. 73; or if the reference is to the Temple at Jerusalem, then we must date it at about A.D. 135. However, Bishop Bernard<sup>4</sup> believes

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, vol. I, note AA.

<sup>2</sup> *Patr. Apos. Opera—in loco*.

<sup>3</sup> *Odes*, p. 54 (2nd edition).

<sup>4</sup> *Texts and Studies*, vol. VIII (1912).

that all the Odes in their present form belong to a period from A.D. 150 to 190, and he attributes them to an Asiatic, perhaps Palestinian, origin. But, obviously, their authorship is unknown, and critical opinion has not settled to what extent they are due to Christian sources. However, some critics<sup>1</sup> consider that the Odes are Christian throughout, being in reality "Hymns to the Baptized,"<sup>2</sup> in which the continued privileges of divine grace lately placed within reach are rapturously sung. As to their relationship to other early Christian writings, a well-known scholar<sup>3</sup> would place the Odes between the I Ep. of Clement and the Ignatian Epistles. They evidence affinity with the mysticism of the Barnabas Ep., and to some extent fall into the line of development of the Pneumatic type of Christology

#### DOCTRINAL TEACHING

The character of the doctrine in the Odes is mystical and highly religious, though not philosophical; but, perhaps, we may venture to say, they provide an atmosphere from which a philosophical doctrine could have sprung, or in which it could have found congenial environment. However, their deepest doctrinal suggestions are not developed in fullness. The conception of the Trinity occurs in several places, of which the most striking expression is the passage:—"The Son

<sup>1</sup> Bp. Bernard, *loc. cit.*, Kittel—*Journal, Theol. Studies*, April 1914.

<sup>2</sup> Bp. Bernard, *loc. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Vernon Bartlet (Oxford).

is the cup, and He Who was milked was the Father, and the Holy Spirit milked Him.”<sup>1</sup> In this statement, the writer evidences a sense of the Unity and co-operation of the Persons of the Godhead, and their distinction from each other in Unity. The same subject is also referred to in Ode XXIII, 20.

The Odes comprise a fairly complete Christology; but our attention will be limited to passages bearing upon the Pneumatic view of the Person of Christ.

#### AFFINITY WITH JOHANNINE THOUGHT

There is apparent in many of the Odes a decided affinity with the Christological thought of St. John's Gospel and Epistles, for “both the Fourth Gospel and the Odes are representative of early Greek-Christian theology which was dominated by the idea that the bodies of the faithful are delivered from corruption by partaking of the Spirit.”<sup>2</sup> Phrases occur which bear so close resemblance to Johannine writings, as to suggest veritable dependence thereon, though actual borrowings from St. John cannot be affirmed with certainty. Yet, at least, “it will be conceded that we are in a Johannine atmosphere.”<sup>3</sup>

#### CHRIST'S EXALTED NATURE

An exalted status is given to the Son of God. He

<sup>1</sup> Ode, 19:2, *seq.* The MS. “N” reads:—“She that milked Him is the Holy Spirit.”—F. C. Burkitt, in *J.T.S.*, April 1912.

<sup>2</sup> F. C. Burkitt, *loc. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Harris, *Odes*, p. 75 (2nd Edition).

is the "Lord Messiah"<sup>1</sup>—an estimate of Christ's Person which is characteristic of the Pneumatic Christology. His Messianic dignity is traced back to the Pre-existent state, when He was the Word with God. Christ's Pre-existent nature is referred to frequently under the term "Word." An odist affirms—"He has caused His knowledge to abound to me, because the mouth of the Lord is the True Word and the Door of the Light,"<sup>2</sup> where the terms Word, Door, Light, recall the language of St. John.<sup>3</sup> In the same Ode the writer proceeds—"For the swiftness of the Word is inexpressible, and like its expression, is its swiftness and force, and its course knows no limit. Never doth it cease. . . . For as its work is, so is its end, for it is light and the dawning of thought . . . they (the words) were penetrated by the Word . . . for the mouth of the Most High spoke to them."<sup>4</sup> In Ode XVI occurs the passage—"For the Word of the Lord searches all things . . . both the invisible, and that which reveals His thoughts."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 17:14; cf. "Our Lord Messiah," 39:10; "the Lord's Messiah," 29:6, etc.

<sup>2</sup> 12:3.

<sup>3</sup> St. John, i, 1; x, 19; i, 9.

<sup>4</sup> 12:5-7, 9-10; cf. Psalm xix. These extracts are suggestive of the Apocryphal Wisdom which is described in similar terms, viz.: "more moving than any motion, she passeth and goeth through all things by reason of her pureness . . . quick, cannot be restrained" (vii, 22-24, Book of Wisdom); and Heb. Ep., iv, 12: "The Word of the Lord . . . quick and powerful," etc.

<sup>5</sup> Ode, 16:19. The metaphysical affinities connect this Christology with Christological development in Ep. Barn., Fourth Gospel, and the Logos doctrine in the Apologists.

## AN ELEVATED MYSTICISM

The Odist thinks of the Divine Revelation, not merely as "words," but as a unified conception, an effluence of the Almighty,<sup>1</sup> objectified in one totality as the Word, which, like the Stoic Logos, the Apocryphal Sophia, the Philonian Logos, penetrates all things. However, beyond the suggestion of the universality of the Word, the philosophical implications are absent. This Word is God's knowledge, His "thought"<sup>2</sup>—the principle of Revelation and of the Cosmic Order. As such, it is intimately related to God, proceeds from Him, and, to an extent, is identified with Him. And since it stands for Christ, there can be no doubt of the writer's assurance of Christ's Pre-existence.

## SUGGESTIVE OF THE LOGOS DOCTRINE

In Ode XLI<sup>3</sup> occur several very unequivocal statements upon the nature of Christ. He is "the Son of the Most High," Who "appeared in the perfection of His Father," and "makes alive" souls. That we are in contact with the Logos Idealism in this Ode is obvious from the passages—"Light dawned from the Word that was before time in Him," i.e., the Father; "the Messiah is truly one, and He was known before

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Sap. Sol., vii, 25.

<sup>2</sup> 28:18. "The Thought of the Most High"; cf. 16:20.

<sup>3</sup> Verses 11-15.

the foundation of the earth.”<sup>1</sup> Here we have a sufficiently definite reference to the distinct hypostatic life of the Word, which He lived with the Father as the Son.<sup>2</sup>

#### 4.—*The Ignatian Epistles*

Though the date of these writings is uncertain, they can be placed on good grounds within the first few years of the second century.<sup>3</sup> Their tone is suggestive of the actual Apostolic literature, and recalls the positive and definite utterances characteristic of the Apostles in recording their new-found Christian experience.

#### SOMEWHAT SPECULATIVE TYPE OF THOUGHT

Ignatius brings his readers into touch with the speculative atmosphere of the East. Asia Minor was the “seat of the earliest higher Christian culture,” and included several centres of learning such as Ephesus,

<sup>1</sup> Verses 15–16. The latter part of v. 16 is thus rendered by M. Labourt:—“Il a été désigné avant la création du monde.”—*Revue Bibl.*, 1910.

<sup>2</sup> Another passage, viz.: “He was before anything came into being” (16:19), appears to refer to the Father, though Bp. Bernard cites it in reference to the Son.

<sup>3</sup> Tixeront (*Dogma*, vol. I) suggests the years from A.D. 107 to 117; Ramsay, W. M. (*op. cit.*, p. 315), gives the date as A.D. 112; while Harnack (*Dogma*, vol. I) prefers A.D. 130—also Dorner and Lightfoot. However, the earlier date appears to be better supported by the subject matter.



Tarsus,<sup>1</sup> and Antioch. Of these cities, the last-named is known to have long supported a philosophical school, and was the chief centre of missionary propaganda to the heathen. Ignatius, a man of vigorous and original mentality, was a resident of Antioch early in the second century. It is then not surprising that his letters should bear traces of speculative views upon Christian doctrine. Though he is concerned primarily with the practical interests of the Church, his letters contain valuable statements upon the theory of the higher nature of Christ.

#### VIEWS ON THE NATURE OF CHRIST

In general, it may be said that Ignatius regards Christ as the Divine Intermediary between the Church and God. Referring to the nature of Christ, he distinguishes between the flesh (σάρξ) and spirit (πνεῦμα)—the former being the visible manifestation, the latter, the invisible or divine element, by which the Church, considered as spiritual, is united to the Father in heaven. As being "flesh," Christ is the "One born," but as being "spirit," He is the Pre-existent personal Spirit, the Divine Son of God.

<sup>1</sup> See Strabo (xiv, 5, 13). "The zeal of its inhabitants for philosophy and general culture is such that they have surpassed even Athens and Alexandria, and all other cities, where schools of philosophy can be mentioned. And its pre-eminence in this respect is so great because there the students are all townspeople, and foreign students do not readily settle there." Strabo was an older contemporary of St. Paul.—Gore, *Belief in Christ*, p. 93.

## MYSTICAL UNION OF CHRIST'S TWO NATURES

Flesh and Spirit exist in Christ in an eternal, mystic union—He is “flesh and spirit, begotten and unbegotten, become God in human form, . . . first passible and then impassible, Jesus Christ our Lord.”<sup>1</sup> Whilst His flesh originated at the Incarnation, the Spirit was prior. As the Divine Being, the Pre-existent Son, He is “above seasons timeless, invisible, for our sakes visible.”<sup>2</sup> His human nature is considered to be in essential connexion with the divine—His blood, the vital principle, is “the blood<sup>3</sup> of God,” and as above, He became “God in Man.” Though the human and divine elements in Christ are boldly contrasted, thus emphasizing the reality of both, they are regarded, nevertheless, as a unity,<sup>4</sup> for He is but one personality.

## THE WRITER'S EXALTED VIEWS OF CHRIST'S PERSON

Ignatius holds most exalted views upon the Person of Christ. He asserts that Christ is God—“our God in us,”<sup>5</sup> that is, the Divine Spirit, as God, Who exists “in us,” the Church. This loftiness of conception is indicated further by the presence of certain Logos-elements in the Epistles. Various passages testify to the writer's sympathy with a form of mysticism

<sup>1</sup> Eph., 7:2.

<sup>2</sup> Polyc., 3:2.

<sup>3</sup> Eph., 1, 1; cf. Justin, I *Apol.*, 32:74B.

<sup>4</sup> Magnes, 1, 2.

<sup>5</sup> Eph., 15:3; cf. 8; cf. “God in man,” Eph., 7:2. “The God,” Smyr., 1:1. In Trall., 7:1, occurs the doubtful reading Θεοῦ Ἰε. Χρ.; another such in Smyr., 6:1, τοῦ Θεοῦ which Lightfoot inserts within brackets.

resembling that in the Johannine literature, though it is not without traces of the incipient gnosticism of the time. However, it is beyond question that Ignatius was not led astray by gnostic speculation. Of his references to the Logos Doctrine, the most striking is the passage wherein he speaks of Christ—"Who is His (God's) Logos, That proceeds from silence."<sup>1</sup>

### THE PRE-EXISTENT CHRIST

We are to notice especially the statement—"That came forth, or proceeded from silence." It savours of gnosticism. "The Silence" (σιγή) was one of the aeons, which, half a century after Ignatius, figured in the Valentinian system. But in the earlier gnostic theories, such terms as "Silence" had not been personified definitely, and, therefore, must have carried a rather different signification. However, Ignatius' meaning can be made sufficiently clear from his use of an equivalent term in another passage in which reference is made to Christ's birth by Mary, viz., "Three mysteries of a cry, which were wrought in the stillness of God. How was He therefore manifested?"<sup>2</sup> What can the "Silence" or "Stillness of God" signify here? The reference is evidently to a period prior to the Incarnation—that period of silence, when

<sup>1</sup> ὅς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ λόγος ἀπὸ σιγῆς πρωελθών—Magn, 8:2.—Lightfoot gives this as the best reading—*Apos. Fathers, in loc.*

<sup>2</sup> Instanced by Lightfoot, *Apos. Fathers*, vol. II, p. 126.—ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ θεοῦ ἐπαρχθη. Πως οὖν ἐφανερώθη; Ephes. 19:1.

there was no articulate revelation. With this is contrasted the appearance of Christ as the uttered Word of God—the visible revelation in word and deed.

#### INTIMATIONS OF THE LOGOS DOCTRINE

The *συνή*, is, therefore, not the gnostic aeon. Nor does the Logos in the previous passage bear the full philosophic sense of Divine Reason—a notion not adopted by Christian writers until about the time of the Apologists.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, Ignatius<sup>2</sup> uses this term as interchangeable with several other expressions, which plainly shows that it had not yet become a terminus technicus. Christ is therefore viewed as the Full Revelation, or the Uttered Word of God, Who pre-existed with Him as the personal Divine Spirit—a view which is further supported by the passage—“Jesus Christ, Who was with the Father before the ages, and in the end appeared.”<sup>3</sup>

From the above passages it is evident that Ignatius held Christ to be God's Divine Word, “by Whom the Father spoke,”<sup>4</sup> Who was afterwards made visible in the Incarnation; and that the Incarnation was not the beginning of the Son's existence, for, in a personal sense, He had dwelt with the Father “before the ages.”

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Tatian, 5:145B. “The Logos proceeding from the Potency of the Father.”

<sup>2</sup> Pfliegerer, *Prim. Christ.*, vol. III, p. 182.

<sup>3</sup> Magn, 6:1, cf. 7:2—Eph., 19:3.

<sup>4</sup> Rom., 8:2.

5.—*The Epistle of Polycarp*

Polycarp was martyred in A.D. 155,<sup>1</sup> but the exact date of his Epistle is not determined.

## CHRIST'S PRE-EXISTENCE

Though the subject is infrequently touched, there occur a few references to the spiritual Pre-existence of Christ. Polycarp states that "everyone who does not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh, is antichrist."<sup>2</sup> Two important points are contained in this statement, viz., that Jesus Christ in "coming," necessarily had previous personal existence, and that He was incarnated. His "coming" or Advent is again referred to as having been known to "the prophets, who foretold the coming of our Lord."<sup>3</sup> The point of view is Johannine,<sup>4</sup> for St. John also sometimes refers to the Incarnation as the "Advent." Therefore, the earthly life of the Son is to be regarded as the continuation of His spiritual, personal existence, under a new manifestation. The same conviction of the pre-incarnate existence of Christ is indicated in the prayer—"Now may God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Eternal Priest Himself, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, build you up in faith."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot, *Apos. Fathers*, part II, vol. I, p. 677.

<sup>2</sup> 7:2.—cf. St. John, ii, 18; II John Ep., vii; I John Ep., iv, 3.

<sup>3</sup> 6:3.

<sup>4</sup> See note 2 above.

<sup>5</sup> Deus autem et Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi et ipse sempiternus Pontifex Dei Filius J. Ch., etc., 12:2.

Despite the scarcity of passages relating directly to the pneumatic view of Christ's Person, the general tone and standpoint of this writing place it in the pneumatic line of Christological development.

#### 6.—*The Preaching of Peter*

Peter's "Preaching" is quoted several times by Clement of Alexandria; and Origen states that the Valentinian Heracleon made use of it. This latter statement would imply that it was in circulation in the year A.D. 160.<sup>1</sup> But von Dobschutz dates it with much probability in the first quarter of the second century.<sup>2</sup>

#### PHILOSOPHICAL ELEMENTS

The "Preaching" describes God in the manner of the current philosophical conceptions, viz.: "one God, Who made the Beginning of all things, and holds the authority of the end. . . . The Invisible, . . . the Incomprehensible, . . . the Unneeding One, . . . the Inconceivable, the Eternal, the Inoriginate, Who made the universe by the Word of His Potency (according to Gnostic writings), that is, by His Son."<sup>3</sup>

#### THE RELATION TO Gnostic THOUGHT

The point of importance in this passage is the expression "by the Word." Pfeiderer regards it as

<sup>1</sup> Pfeiderer, *op. cit.*, vol. IV, p. 400.

<sup>2</sup> *Das Kerugma Petri* (Leipsic, 1893).

<sup>3</sup> Clem., Strom, vi, 5:39; cf. 7:58.

merely parallel with the statement in the Ep. to Hebrews, viz.: "by the Word of His power."<sup>1</sup> But this can hardly be correct, seeing that Peter's phrase is explained by the sequel—"by His Son." The reference to "Gnostic writings" does not minimize the Christian importance of these statements, but rather accentuates it. The fact is, Peter believed that the Logos, or "Word of His Potency" was the Divine Son. And further, the type of thought which can describe the Deity in the above abstract terms can be considered as quite capable, at least, of personalizing the Word, and of conceiving of the pre-existence of the Divine Person signified, as for example, after the manner of the Fourth Gospel.

#### REFERENCE TO CHRIST IN PROPHECIES

Peter's "Preaching" proceeds to notice the mysterious utterances of the prophets who "speak of Christ Jesus, partly in parables and in enigmas, and partly expressly and in so many words." The writer then states—"And there are found set down His Coming, etc."<sup>2</sup> Great weight is placed upon a similar interpretation of prophecy by Barnabas and Justin Martyr in their efforts to find Christ foretold in the Old Testament. Those dark sayings alluded to are taken as intimations of the existence of a certain Divine Person abiding in eternity, yet ever active in the providential government of the world, Who, in

<sup>1</sup> Heb., i, 3.    <sup>2</sup> *παρουσία* cf. Clement of A., Strom., vi, 15:128.

due course, will make His "Appearance"<sup>1</sup> upon the earth. The term "Word" in the passage above is seen to be associated with the Johannine idea of a divine "Advent."

#### CHRIST'S PRE-EXISTENCE

If the "Word" is the "Son," that is, Jesus Christ of prophecy, then the Word, which was the Divine Agent in Creation, must stand for the personal and revelational Divine Logos. The cumulative effect, then, of the foregoing statements in the "Preaching" indicates that the writer believed that Christ had a personal existence as the spiritual Son of God, with the Father, prior to His Advent.

#### 7.—*The Second Epistle of Clement.*

The authorship of this Epistle, or rather homily, is ascribed by Harnack<sup>2</sup> to Bishop Soter of Rome; though Lightfoot believes it to be written by some unknown person in the Corinthian Church.<sup>3</sup> However, there appear to be no firm grounds for these or any other views as to its authorship. Uncertainty also attaches to its date. While Harnack<sup>4</sup> argues for a date not earlier than A.D. 160 (or a year between 130 and 150 if written from Rome), Lightfoot<sup>5</sup> places it

<sup>1</sup> *παρουσία*.

<sup>2</sup> Gebhardt-Harnack—*Prolegomena*, p. xci.

<sup>3</sup> *Apos. Fath.*, intro., part I, vol II, p. 208.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 208.



between the years 120 and 140. However, Prof. Vernon Bartlet, as against Harnack chiefly, prefers the date A.D. 130, and considers that its probable place of writing was Alexandria.<sup>1</sup>

#### INTERPRETATION OF THE NATURE OF CHRIST

The writer of II Clement takes as the point of departure in his Christology the requirement that we should "think<sup>2</sup> of Christ as God." The general Christian belief was that the divine nature was "spirit."<sup>3</sup> Believing Christ to be divine, our author attributes to Him the same essential nature as the Father has, viz., "Christ the Lord Who saved us, though He be originally Spirit,<sup>4</sup> etc." The *πνεῦμα* in Christ is the personal element which "was manifested in the flesh of Christ," the *σάρξ* being but a veil of the Spirit. This is essentially the pneumatic point of view.

#### SPIRIT AND FLESH CONTRASTED

"The *σάρξ* is conceived in a sublimated way, proper to Alexandrian Platonism, as the antitype of the Spirit which determines it," or, as the author simply expresses it—"this flesh is an antitype of the spirit; no one, therefore, who has corrupted the antitype shall receive the reality." And elsewhere he states—"The Church was spiritual, as was also our Jesus,

<sup>1</sup> II Clem.—in *Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*.

<sup>2</sup> I, 1.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. St. John, iv, 24.

<sup>4</sup> 9:5.

but He was made manifest in the last days, that He might save us." Here we have the type (πνεῦμα) and antitype (σάρξ)—the reality (αὐθεντικόν) and shadow, in prominent juxtaposition. The same principle of relationship applies to the Incarnation in respect to the pre-existent condition of Christ. The spiritual Church and the spiritual Christ are set in contrast with the visible Church and the Incarnate Christ. But the members of the first pair stand on the same level in regard to a common spiritual element. Of each, God is the Cause. Consequently, both Church and Christ are subordinate to God.

#### CHRIST PRE-EXISTENT

Very clearly the author declares that Christ "being originally Spirit, became flesh," whereby an actual Incarnation is implied, and not a mere assumption of another individual's human body by a Being Who previously existed in spiritual form. He sometimes seems to confuse the functions of Christ with those of God. For instance, in one passage he exhorts his readers to "await the Kingdom of God," the appearance of which is designated the "day of God's appearing." But in the following sentence, it is evident that "God's appearing" is held to be equivalent to the Second Coming of Christ. Incidentally, this equation intimates the high reverence with which Christ was invested. Again, passages attributed to Christ in the Gospels are cited as the words of God,

## CHRIST EQUAL TO GOD.

An example will suffice—"It is no credit to you if ye love them that love you,"<sup>1</sup> which he introduces with the words "God says." But, conversely, a passage from Isaiah<sup>2</sup> is quoted as a saying of Christ. Harnack<sup>3</sup> reminds us that "the interchange of God and Christ is not always the expression of the high dignity of Christ, but, on the contrary, frequently proves that the personal significance of Christ is misunderstood, and that He is understood only as a dependent Revealer of God." But despite Harnack, the writer of II Clement is not to be condemned entirely for his apparently inaccurate use of scripture.<sup>4</sup> For he opened his writing by assuring us, as regards Christ's divine nature, that He should be thought of as God.<sup>5</sup> His personality would thus appear to have approximated so closely in value to that of God in its nature and dignity, that our author can perceive no essential error in attributing scriptural statements of the One to the Other. The question of a confusion of personalities hardly arises, since these early writers lacked an exact definition of personality in the modern sense. Therefore, they could make with facility the

<sup>1</sup> Luke, vi, 32, in chapter 13:4; cf. St. Peter Ep., I, ii, 3, where Psalm 34:8 is cited as referring to Christ, although the Lord mentioned therein is Jehovah.

<sup>2</sup> 17:4-13:2; 2:3.

<sup>3</sup> *Dogma*, vol. I, p. 188, E.T.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Ep. Barnabas, 5:6; cf. Justin, I *Apol.* 33:75D.

<sup>5</sup> See p. 56, note 2.

above interchange of names and functions without actually degrading the position of the Son.

### 8.—*Hermas Shepherd*

Though the date of this work is uncertain, it is known to have been "in general circulation soon after the middle of the second century."<sup>1</sup>

### ADOPTIONIST AND PNEUMATIC

Its Christology is representative of both the Adoptionist and Pneumatic types, though Harnack classes it as a whole under the former.<sup>2</sup> The Pneumatic elements are found mainly in the two Similitudes V and IX. In Sim. V the nature of Christ is referred to as a dual union of the flesh and the "Holy Pre-existent Spirit." From Sim. V, 6, 5 it is inferred that the flesh is a mere tabernacle for the Spirit. Yet further, the flesh is shown to have volition of its own, and moral choice. As a result it becomes peculiarly exalted, and, having walked with the Spirit, it is rewarded with the honour of adoption by God. Thus, this physical basis of humanity the "flesh" was chosen by God for the habitation of the Spirit; and the flesh and the Spirit in this unique moral union constitute the Incarnate Son of God.

### WHAT IS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE "SPIRIT" ?

A question arises, Is this Spirit personal? It would appear that its personality as the historical Son of

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot, *op. cit.*, Intro., p. 293.    <sup>2</sup> *Dogma*, vol. I, p. 196, E.T.

God or Messiah is the result of its habitation in the flesh of Jesus. The flesh obeys the Spirit, and thence the resultant human person is able to carry out the work of Redemption, which is a typically personal work. But then, Hermas<sup>1</sup> attributes to ordinary Christians the same Spirit which is in Jesus: there is one indwelling of the Holy Spirit in all believers, without any distinction; and Hermas even gives Him the same functions in both cases. The Spirit is found to be personalized in each Christian, while He exists personally in Christ in fullness. But He is always the same Spirit, immanent in the heart of the faithful—the same in nature as His personal antitypal Source in heaven, Who stands in the relation of the Son.<sup>2</sup>

#### THE PRE-EXISTENT CHRIST IS THE "SPIRIT"

Yet again, Hermas held that there was also a Spirit in the sense of a Divine Pre-existent Person, the Son<sup>3</sup> of God. Thus in *Sim.* ix, 6, 1, we are told that "the Holy Spirit Which spoke with you in the form of the Church, . . . that Spirit is the Son of God." But in *Sim.* v, 6, 1, in reply to the question "Why is the Son of God represented in the form of a slave?"<sup>4</sup> it is stated that "The Son of God is not represented in the form of a slave, but of great authority and lordship." Then, what Son is this? He must be Jesus Christ, because to Him God gave the vineyard,<sup>5</sup> and it was He Who suffered in order to cleanse human sins.

<sup>1</sup> *Sim.*, v, 7:1-12.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, v, 6:7; cf. 2:6 fol.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, ix, 1:1.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, v, 5:5.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, v, 6:2.

## CHRIST PRE-EXISTENT AND THE HOLY SPIRIT

But again, we are asked to "listen why the Lord took His Son and the glorious angels as counsellors concerning the inheritance of the Slave."<sup>1</sup> This cannot be the same Son as in the previous question, for it was with this Son that God took counsel about the Slave, i.e., Jesus Christ. The only other Son is the Holy Spirit, Who is mentioned in the passage above.<sup>2</sup> This Spirit is assumed to be the active, Divine Agent in the Creation, viz.: "The Holy Pre-existent Spirit, Which made the whole Creation, God caused to dwell in the flesh which He willed."<sup>3</sup> And the same Spirit must be that Son Who is "older than all creation," and is God's chosen "Counsellor"<sup>4</sup> in connection therewith, for both these "Sons" are said to be manifested in Jesus.

The term "Son" is an unusual designation for the Holy Spirit,<sup>5</sup> but it results, probably, from the emphasis Hermas lays upon the Spirit. For, to Hermas, flesh is purely creaturely, while Spirit is divine. In his view, the Holy Spirit, not, of course, the Third Person of the Trinity, but the essential active Spirit of the Divine Nature,<sup>6</sup> is really the Christ, the Son of God.

<sup>1</sup> Sim., v, 6:4.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, ix, 1:1.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, v, 6:5.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, ix, 12:2; cf. Sim., v, 6:4.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, ix, 1:1. Donaldson (*Hist. of Christian Lit.*, vol. I, p. 284), states that herein is no reference to Christ, but only to the "Son" of the parable.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, ix, 1:1.

## WHAT IS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TERM SON?

The foregoing citations raise the question, Are there two Sons? Reply must be made in the affirmative. There is the pre-mundane creative Son, a purely spiritual Being, next in honour and dignity to God, the absolute Source and Creator of all : and then there is the historical but unique Son, Jesus Christ, in Whom the nature of the pre-mundane Son is present as the divine element, as also in a lower measure in all Christians. Sonship, in the case of the historical Son is an achievement through moral fidelity, and not an inherent quality by nature.

## SUMMARY OF RELEVANT PASSAGES :

To present in brief form a comprehensive view of the teaching of Hermas upon the Pre-existent Son, we assemble the following passages :

“ The Holy Spirit<sup>1</sup> is the Son of God,” and “ He was manifested<sup>2</sup> in the last days.”

“ The Name of the Son of God is great and incomprehensible, and supports the whole world.”<sup>3</sup>

“ The Lord hath sworn by His Son,<sup>4</sup> him that denieth the Son and Himself, *They* shall deny in the days to come.”

“ The Holy Spirit<sup>5</sup> Which made all Creation, God caused to dwell in the flesh which He willed.”

<sup>1</sup> Sim., ix, 1:1.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, ix, 12:3.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, ix, 14:5.

<sup>4</sup> Vis., ii, 2:8, i.e., the Son on equality with the Father in divinity, dignity, authority.

<sup>5</sup> Sim., v, 6:5.

And "The Son of God is older than all Creation, so that He became the Father's Counsellor in His Creation."<sup>1</sup>

From these passages it is clear that Hermas considered that the proper "Son of God" was hypostatically distinct from the Father, and that He pre-existed as a divine, personal Spirit, even before the Creation.

Though Hermas makes no express reference to the Logos Doctrine, certain phrases occur which cover part of that teaching. The following instances will suffice: The Son of God is identified with the Sophia of Proverbs;<sup>2</sup> is more ancient than Creation;<sup>3</sup> is the Counsellor<sup>4</sup> of the Father at the Creation; is God's Messenger *κατ' ἐξοχήν*; and the Creative Logos.<sup>5</sup> The conception of the Pre-existent personal Spirit is a religious basis for the Logos idea, expressed in Hebraic rather than in Greek terms.

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS

The foregoing review of certain Sub-Apostolic writers establishes effectually the existence of a belief, widespread geographically and covering more than half a century of time prior to the period of our

<sup>1</sup> Sim., ix, 12:2.

<sup>2</sup> Sim., ix, 12; cf. Justin, *Dialogue*, 61; Theophilus II, 10.

<sup>3</sup> Sim., ix, 12:2.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, cf. Theophilus II, 22.

<sup>5</sup> Sim., V, 6:5; cf. Dorner, *op. cit.*, Div. I, Vol. I., pp. 133 and 388 E.T.)



Apologists, that the Christ was the Incarnation of the Pre-existent, Spiritual Son of God. And it is clear that these writers also held firmly that Christ's human life was truly real, being the visible manifestation upon earth of the personal Spiritual Son.

Though, as we saw, explicit references to the Logos doctrine are infrequent, it is evident that the Christology of these writers is essentially allied to that conception. For, to use the Johannine phraseology as a test, as "Logos<sup>1</sup> was in the Beginning," so was the Pre-existent Son "before the Ages" and Creation; as "Logos was with God," so was the Pre-existent Son; and as "Logos was God," so is the Pre-existent Son several times identified with God.

These works prepare the way for the Apologists and present to us, it may be, those very materials out of which, by the aid of their philosophy, the Apologists evolved a more scientific, systematic, and comprehensive doctrine of the Person of Christ.

<sup>1</sup> John, i, 1.

## CHAPTER II

### THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS

#### INTRODUCTORY

**T**HIS very interesting writing dates, probably, from the first half of the second century.<sup>1</sup> Formerly attributed to Justin Martyr, its authorship is now regarded as totally unknown. In literary style it is far removed from Justin's ; and also the manner in which the Logos is viewed makes it impossible that the same author could have written the Apologies and this Epistle. Its marked simplicity in stating theological doctrine, and its prominent evangelical element, both indicate an early date, and lead to the belief that it was composed prior to that period when Christian doctrine had become intellectualized after the manner of the schools.

The writer possesses considerable power of expression and argumentative ability, by which we are reminded sometimes of the splendid periods of Athenagoras, a writer of the same age, although no evidence is discernible of that masterly grasp of theological

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, p. 488 ; Kruger (*Hist. Early Christian Lit.*) suggests a date prior to A.D. 135.

and philosophical knowledge so noticeable in the latter.

#### ATTITUDE TO PHILOSOPHY

Similarly with many other Christian writings of the age, "Diognetus" exhibits a professed scorn for the current philosophy,<sup>1</sup> the writer believing that he has come into possession of something by revelation from God through the Logos, which is far superior to man's discoveries—"the vain and absurd statements of pretentious philosophers."<sup>2</sup> Ridicule is cast upon some of the ancient philosophic schools, as also upon the current Stoicism, though the writer may not be qualified to express such judgments. By no means so scholastic as the writings of the Apologists discussed in the sequel, this Epistle serves to mark an earlier stage in the departure from the simple traditional terminology, when Christian thought was beginning to pursue a course which was to lead, eventually, to the Alexandrian Christology.

#### THE TYPE OF THOUGHT

Though the general type of thought appears to be Alexandrian<sup>3</sup>, certain phrases and statements show acquaintance with the Johannine literature. For

<sup>1</sup> As also Justin, Tatian, Theophilus, Athenagoras, and many others.

<sup>2</sup> 8:4, 499B. "These things are the quackery and deceit of cheats."

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Lightfoot, *op. cit.*

example, Christians "are not of this world"<sup>1</sup>; "for God loved"<sup>2</sup> the world; "He sent His Only-Begotten Son"<sup>3</sup>; "He is from the Beginning"<sup>4</sup>; and other such references. The same religious mysticism is revealed in the Epistle as is characteristic of St. John, especially in respect to the divine life in Christ, in the Father, and in the Christian believer.

In "Diognetus," we have a noble example of early Christian writing of apologetic character and intention. Instructive, interesting, fervid at times, dignified always, elevated in thought and conception, this Epistle rightly occupies a high place in its own period.

We now proceed to review, very briefly, the Christological and philosophical teaching under various heads.

### *I.—The Nature of God the Father*

The author's definition of the Supreme God is, on the whole, consonant with the usual philosophical account of Deity common in the cultured literature of the period, and, consequently, calls for no special discussion. God is described as "the Almighty, All-creating and Invisible God,"<sup>5</sup> Who, as the writer often declares, is beyond man's knowledge, and could

<sup>1</sup> 6:3—cf. St. John, xvii, 11, 14.

<sup>2</sup> 10:2—cf. St. John, iii, 16.

<sup>3</sup> 10:2—cf. St. John, I Epist., iv, 9

<sup>4</sup> 11:4—cf. St. John, 1, 1.

<sup>5</sup> 7:498c.

never have been known to man except "He had revealed Himself"<sup>1</sup> by the Son. God is the "Master and Fashioner of the Universe, Who made all things and arranged them in order."<sup>2</sup>

The moral aspect of the Supreme is not forgotten. He, like a Father, "was always, is, and will be, good, compassionate and true, and He alone is good."<sup>3</sup> He is "friendly to man and long-suffering,"<sup>4</sup> and for ages had stored up in mystery His loving design to save men from sin through His Son.

## II.—*The Christology*

The author presents the Christology under two main heads, viz., (a) Christ, the Word or Revealer of God ; and (b) Christ, the Redeemer of man. On the whole the Christology is simpler than that found in Justin and the other Apologists discussed later. While these writers dilate largely upon the cosmological significance of the Logos, the writer of Diognetus outlines a Christology less philosophical, and more in harmony with the New Testament account. Its most prominent feature is Christ's soteriological work ; for, not only is Christ the unique Revealer of God, the Father, communicating "truth and holy

<sup>1</sup> 8:499c.

<sup>2</sup> 8:499c. As with other writers, there is apparent confusion as to who is Creator, the Father or Son, God or Logos. Really what is meant is that Logos is the Father's agent Who carries out the Divine Will. See p. 70, note 2.

<sup>3</sup> 8:8, 499c.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

teaching, which surpasses the thought of man," but, moreover, He is the Saviour of men's souls, giving His life a sufficient ransom for human sins.

Though the name of Jesus or Christ<sup>1</sup> is nowhere found in the Epistle, no doubt is left with the reader as to the identity of the Person Who is designated the Logos. Repeatedly, it is asserted that the Logos is God's Son, the Redeemer of man; and other references to the work of Christ render the identity unquestionable.

#### PATRIPASSIAN TENDENCIES

In certain passages, on first reading, it would seem that the author anticipated to some extent the patripassian position. For instance, he states that "No man has either seen God or made Him known; but He has revealed Himself."<sup>2</sup> But does the *ἐαυτὸν* in this passage mean Christ? The Christian reader would naturally believe it did; that is, that God revealed Himself in Christ.<sup>3</sup> But the writer's subsequent remarks leave this point in doubt. In the following chapter it is stated that "God took upon Himself our sins."<sup>4</sup> Considered alone, this statement could be taken to mean that the Father suffered on the cross. But closer scrutiny shows that all the writer intends to convey is that God was so deeply concerned

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 196, 227.

<sup>2</sup> 8:5, 499A.

<sup>3</sup> Discussion in Donaldson, *Hist. Ch. Lit.*, vol. II; cf. St. John, i, 18.

<sup>4</sup> 9:2, 500B.

over man's sins, that He acted as though man's iniquity had been His own, and therefore devised a magnificent scheme for getting rid of it by "giving His own Son a ransom on our behalf."

#### ESTIMATE OF THE PERSON OF CHRIST

The Person of the Son of God is represented as being superlatively exalted. For example, when God determined to give effect to His "great and inexpressible scheme" for man's salvation, He selected,<sup>1</sup> not as some would have expected, an Angel, an Archon, or some mighty Spirit who presided over earth's affairs, or some Being entrusted with the dispensations of heaven, but the "very Artificer and Creator of the Universe Himself,"<sup>2</sup> Who rules all things in heaven and earth, and also the region intermediate between the two.<sup>3</sup> "Him He (God) sent as sending God."<sup>4</sup> Language could hardly more effectively express the writer's sense of the extreme exaltation of the Person of the Logos. And as fortifying this estimate, it is declared that the Son was considered by the Father as being the only Person worthy of being consulted upon the divine determination to create the universe, viz., "He planned the universe in His mind, with His Son."<sup>5</sup> The Son is also expressly said to be "from the beginning"<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 8:499D.

<sup>3</sup> 7:498D; cf. *Athenag.*, p. 223.

<sup>5</sup> 9:I, 499D.

<sup>2</sup> 7:498C.

<sup>4</sup> 7:499A.

<sup>6</sup> 11:4,501D.

and "eternal,"<sup>1</sup> sharing the true nature of the Father.

2.—*The Subordination and Divinity of the Son, the Logos*

In a manner almost identical with what we find set forth in the other Apologists, this writer teaches the Subordination of the Logos to the Father. We have just seen how highly exalted is the Person of the Logos—He is Divine, even God. The most significant statement—"Him He (God) sent as sending God" reminds of St. John.<sup>2</sup> Here the term Θεός is used in a subordinate sense; and in a number of other passages the subjection of the Logos to the authority of the Father is clearly indicated. It is the Father Who conceives the plan both of Creation and of Salvation, and these He communicates to the Son<sup>3</sup> to execute, as His Vicegerent. Likewise, it is by the Logos that the Father does everything within the universe, such as governing and administering its affairs.<sup>4</sup> The Father sends the Son: consequently, whatever Divinity the Son possesses is secondary to the Father, in a certain aspect. Since the Logos is "God," and the Father is "The God," there must be a difference in the significance of the term as applied to the Son in the one case, and to the Father in the other. The

<sup>1</sup> 11:5, 502A.

<sup>2</sup> St. John, i, 1. Similar applications of the term Theos will be found in discussions upon Justin, see p. 163, note 3.

<sup>3</sup> 8:499D,

<sup>4</sup> 7:498, C-D,



probability is that the writer intends that the same distinction be made in the use of the term in this connection as has been explained in the case of the writers referred to above.

The Son had Pre-existence with the Father in a hypostatic sense. This is indicated in the oft-repeated expression<sup>1</sup>—"God sent forth the Logos, or Son." And being by nature identical with the Father, the Son must also be regarded as absolutely eternal,<sup>2</sup> and as such, necessarily and truly Divine.

### 3.—*The Logos, the Creative Agent and Dispensator of the World*

The writer often refers to the creative work of the Logos. Apparently, as in the case of the other Apologists, the Father is the actual Creator, but the Logos, being His Vicegerent, acts as His general executive officer.<sup>3</sup>

In fulfilling His part as the Divine Dispensator of the universe, the Logos occupies a unique position. He is appointed by the Father to be that Person "by Whom all things are ordered and bounded and placed in subjection,"<sup>4</sup> both earthly and heavenly things, and things in the intermediate realm. All these works carried on and administered continuously, constitute in the writer's opinion "proofs of His presence."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> E.g., in 11:501D.

<sup>2</sup> 11:501D, see p. 222 seq.

<sup>3</sup> 7:498C.

<sup>4</sup> 7:498D, cf. Colos. Epist., i, 16; Justin, *Dial.*, 11:228A; Justin, *II Apol.*, 5:44A.

<sup>5</sup> 7:499B.

4.—*The Logos, the Divine Saviour and the World's Moral Governor*

Attention has already been called to the fact that in Diognetus Christ's soteriological work receives prominence, a prominence greater far than it obtains in certain other Apologists. The object of Christ's coming to earth was man's Salvation.

The whole grand scheme for the Redemption of the human race was planned "in the mind of the Father with the Son" in consultation. After having borne with man's sin for ages, the Father "Himself parted with His very own Son as a ransom for us." "For in whom was it possible for men to be justified except in the Son?"

5.—*The Son, the Logos, the Revealer of the Father to Men*

Having stated that the great and unutterable scheme of man's Salvation was planned "in the mind of the Father with the Son,"<sup>1</sup> the author proceeds to magnify the fact that man by himself could never have become cognisant thereof except the Father had pleased to reveal it through His Son. Great as is God's love and goodness toward man, to the sons of men these divine sentiments could never have been fully revealed but by the Son. The writer states that these things were "revealed openly by the Logos to

the disciples,"<sup>1</sup> and that "the Logos appeared and declared them, speaking plainly."<sup>2</sup> For this cause the Father "sent forth the Logos that He might appear unto the world."<sup>3</sup> The Johannine point of view in these statements is noticeable.

#### 6.—*The Logos, the Divine Mediator*

Since, as our author declares, no subordinate Being could be adequate as Mediator between God and man, be such an one even an Archon,<sup>4</sup> Angel, or any other dignitary in the heavenly sphere, therefore, God sent "the very Artificer and Creator of the universe"<sup>5</sup> by Whom He disposed all things; for to send this exalted Personage was equivalent in all relevant matters to God's coming to the earth Himself.<sup>6</sup>

The Logos in the rôle of Mediator appears on earth as Man,<sup>7</sup> but despite His Manhood, He is competent to act as God's Vicegerent in the world, and as the Divine Dispensator of history. As Mediator, He is also the divinely appointed Ransom<sup>8</sup> for human sin, and the Justifier and Saviour<sup>9</sup> of mankind.

From the foregoing it is evident that the Logos is considered to be the only adequate Mediator fully competent to represent the Father, with Whom He is equal in essence though inferior as to office, being

<sup>1</sup> II:50IB.

<sup>2</sup> II:50ID, cf. St. John, vii, 26; xvi, 29; xviii, 20.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> 7:2, 488C.

<sup>5</sup> 7:498C.

<sup>6</sup> ὡς Θεὸν ἐπεμψεν—7:3, 499A.

<sup>7</sup> 7:3, 449A

<sup>8</sup> 9:2, 500B.

<sup>9</sup> 9:4 and 6, 500C.

capable in the first place of creating the universe<sup>1</sup> and of administering its affairs, empowered to declare and to impose the Father's will both in human affairs and in cosmical dispensations, and, furthermore, to act as the Revealer of God's love to man, eventually becoming Himself the sufficient Ransom for man's iniquity acceptable to the Father in heaven.

<sup>1</sup> 8:9, 499D.

# THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE APOLOGISTS JUSTIN, TATIAN, THEOPHILUS, AND ATHENAGORAS

## INTRODUCTORY

### *General Observations*

THE Christology in all four Apologists, broadly speaking, is the same in general character. But the truth of this generalization must be modified when the many differences in conception and variations in expression, according to the tastes and preferences of the individual writers, are taken into consideration. These differences, however, are concerned not with primary principles but with matters of secondary importance.

## APOSTOLIC DOCTRINE

It seems probable that the Christological teaching of the Apologists is a faithful representation of that type of doctrine which enjoyed general acceptance in the Church at the time. When these writers refer to the sources of their doctrine, it is often with the intention of showing that it was not of their own

invention. "We have received," or "learned"<sup>1</sup> they commonly plead, and at the same time point to Scripture and Church tradition in support. But while the doctrinal content of their Christology is scriptural, the Apologists give evidence that they have possessed themselves, as of a rightful inheritance from the past, of the various interpretations<sup>2</sup> with which the development of doctrine had coloured the scriptural ground facts. For these traditional elements which are relevant to their purpose, they show great respect and never consciously vary them by innovations.

#### OPPONENTS OF GNOSTICISM AND ALL HETERODOXY

Professedly conservatives in their attitude to ecclesiastical doctrine, the Apologists stand in marked contrast to the Gnostics, the doctrinal "free-lances" of the age. Had the Apologists been inclined to introduce new elements into the substance of doctrine, there was abundance of material in the contemporary Gnostic speculations alone, from which they could have selected. For decades prior, various false forms of Christological teaching had been evolving, some of which reached maturity in the great Gnostic systems of A.D. 170. With these Justin was not unacquainted.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Justin, I *Apol.*, 10; Tatian, 5; *Athenag.*, 7, 9, 10. They implore the Emperors whom they address to verify their doctrines and arguments by reference to the ancient Scriptures.

<sup>2</sup> Especially the Pneumatic hypothesis—see Chap. I.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 95, notes 1, 2, 3.

But apparently they exerted no recognizable influence upon the doctrinal elements of his Christology.

#### POSSIBLE Gnostic INFLUENCE

However, it may be noted in passing that there is one way in which conceivably Gnosticism could have affected the forms under which Christology was presented. Indeed, it may even be true that some of those philosophical elements, which distinguish orthodox Christology in the second century, owe their inclusion therein to the Church's contact with Gnostic theories. However this may be, it is interesting to note that certain philosophical terms found in the Apologists occur also with analogous applications in Gnostic writings, e.g., *λόγος*, *οὐσία*, *μόρφη*, *ιδέα*, *ἐνεργεία*, *προπηδάν*.<sup>1</sup>

#### THE CHURCH'S DEFENCE AGAINST Gnosticism

While Christians of necessity shared the same intellectual environment in general as the Gnostics, and naturally could not resist entirely the influence resulting therefrom, their hostility to Gnosticism,<sup>2</sup> on account of its pagan elements, prevented their succumbing to its teaching. But this resistance to Gnostic doctrine had the effect, probably, of persuad-

<sup>1</sup> See p. 184.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 95. As early as the first generation of Christians, St. Paul warns them against "theosophy, which is specious make-belief."—Coloss. ii, 8.

ing the Church to observe a more exclusive conservatism in doctrine, and to proceed in the preparation of a more precise statement of its own teaching. While orthodox teachers were bound to be conservative in respect to the elements of Christian doctrine, the Gnostics were under no such limitation, and, as their writings show, were ready to supply the times with such intellectual and spiritual provender as met with acceptance.

#### THE TYPE OF DOCTRINE NECESSARY FOR THE TIMES

But the popularity attained by Gnosticism serves to indicate that any religion which was to make its way in this age must include as conspicuous elements in its composition a certain intellectualism and mystery. Dogma alone did not sufficiently appeal ; it must be partly hid and its significance accentuated by the mysterious, unfathomable doctrines of mystical philosophy. Gnosticism, especially in those schools which had closer affinity with Christianity, pioneered a new path for the Church, along which she was soon to march, but clad in such accoutrements as she should choose for herself. That orthodox Christianity derived advantages from the Gnostics is obvious ; that she borrowed or adapted from them some of the controversial weapons used most effectively in gaining victory over Hellenic culture and the mystery religions, is true ; but it is undoubted that the Church was never subjected to Gnosticism.



## THE SOURCE OF THE APOLOGISTS' LOGOS DOCTRINE

Nor may we look to Gnosticism for the immediate source of the Christian Logos doctrine. We have indicated elsewhere the existence of this form of speculation in the general philosophical religion of the age. From this medley of doctrines, the Apologists derived the idea in germ. Though a possible source for the Apologists' Christology has sometimes been sought in the Fourth Gospel, the difficulties connected with the interpretation of certain terms contained in the Prologue make this suggestion almost valueless. For instance, besides uncertainty both as to the date and authorship of this work, we cannot be sure of the precise meaning and significance of those mysterious expressions<sup>1</sup> in the early verses of the Prologue. Confessedly then, it would be futile to attempt to find in St. John the source of the Christian Logos doctrine.

<sup>1</sup> It is uncertain whether St. John's "Logos" stands for the O.T. "Word," as it is assumed generally by certain conservative scholars, or for the divine "Reason," as more advanced opinion holds. Also the term Theos is not clear in meaning.

J. Drummond (*Theol. Review*, 1877) considers for several good reasons, that Justin had the Fourth Gospel as the Evangelical source of his Logos doctrine. But if this is so, it seems strange that he never quotes that Gospel, at least, with exactness, though he does quote some of the Synoptists.

But E. A. Abbott (*Modern Review*, 1882) takes another view that "Justin's whole theory of the Logos is not so developed as that of the Gospel, and approximates more closely to that of Philo."

We cannot say confidently that any of the Apologists had the Fourth Gospel, except Theophilus, who cites a passage (*Ad Autol.*, II, 22:100B.)

See Fairweather, *Jesus and the Greeks*, p. 206 fol.

From the theological standpoint, the criticism may fairly be made that the Christology of the Apologists is mainly a "Logos Doctrine." With the exception of Justin, our Apologists ignore almost entirely the soteriological aspect of Christ and His earthly life. However, that they all affirm emphatically that He is "the Logos" leaves no room for doubt that this speculative view of Christ was considered in their time to be of first-rate importance.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF A MORE REFLECTIVE TYPE OF DOCTRINE

Christians are now no longer content with the vague unreflective statements upon the Person of Christ which in a former age were considered sufficient. A new, more free, more thoughtful spirit had arisen to characterize Christian doctrinal statements. In response thereto, the Apologists seek to investigate and to define scientifically the Christian conception<sup>1</sup> of the Son of God, the Logos. Their writings show that their inquiries were directed to the elucidation of such problems as the nature of the Logos, His relation to the

<sup>1</sup> Celsus, as an outsider, gives evidence that Christians assigned to Christ a very exalted position in the divine economy, and that this position was philosophically secured. He states that Christians worship Jesus as the "Son of God," although He came to earth only a few years before. (*True Word*, i, 26; viii, 12; vi, 10; ii, 4), calling Him "The Logos" (ii, 31), and "Very God" (iv, 2; iii, 41, 42). He believed that Christians held Christ to be divine so essentially, that if Christ were to descend upon earth, the whole universe (in Celsus' opinion) would necessarily be disordered (iv, 5).

Father, His generation and connection with the world, and also to certain more practical issues, such as His functions in the capacity of Mediator of the Father, and the Redeemer of men. But even before the time of our Apologists, certain Christians are known to have been interested in such inquiries.<sup>1</sup> If these philosophical Christians, whether our Apologists themselves or those before them, ever drew up any systematic statements of the results of their studies, no knowledge of them has reached modern times. However, in these Apologetic works,<sup>2</sup> we have, probably, a fairly complete account of their conclusions, though not in systematic form.

#### THEIR DOCTRINAL LIMITATIONS AS APOLOGISTS

The doctrines presented are those especially which the practical necessities of the "defence" of Christians<sup>3</sup> required; and each point is treated only with that measure of fullness and in such a manner, as the needs of the occasion dictated. Hence, the result is only a partial statement. Indeed, there is no indication that a comprehensive account of Christology was ever intended. Christology for an Apologist,

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Barnabas, Hegesippus, Aristides, Quadratus.

<sup>2</sup> See Harnack, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 209, note 2. Patrick (*Celsus*, p. 104) considers that there are signs in the *True Word* of Celsus that there existed a school of Christian dogmatics in Justin's time different from his, and an apologetic more advanced than his.

<sup>3</sup> Apologetic writings were intended primarily to defend Christians against false charges, and not to explain and defend ecclesiastical doctrine as against pagan or gnostic theories.

except in the *Dialogue* of Justin, would appear to be a mere incidental feature of the discourse, introduced to aid in the movement and force of the argument. This is specially noticeable in the *Supplicatio* of Athenagoras who, as his clearly-expressed, persuasive argument sweeps along, finds it appropriate at a certain stage to introduce the "Son of God," the Logos.<sup>1</sup> Thence, so as to prevent misunderstanding of the expression "Son of God" in the Christian sense, he proceeds to explain it in current theological terms. Numerous other instances<sup>2</sup> more or less parallel with the above may be found in the other Apologists.

#### DOCTRINAL FUNDAMENTALS

All the Apologists are emphatic upon the great importance of a correct belief in the Son of God, which is the basic principle of their system. But they looked back a step further, and insisted also upon proper opinions as to the Father. Justin informs his aged Christian interviewer (as he relates in the *Dialogue*), that he defines "God" as "that which always has the same nature and in the same manner, and is the Cause of all other things," and is "beyond all essence, unutterable,<sup>3</sup> etc." Though this opinion was expressed prior to his conversion, he maintained

<sup>1</sup> *Supplicatio*, 10.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Justin I *Apol.*, 21, 22; II *Apol.*, 8, 10, 13; *Theoph.* I, 10, 22, etc.

<sup>3</sup> *Dial.*, 3:220E, 4:221D.

the same position in principle when a Christian, affirming that "God is One" and "ever remains in celestial places," and is without movement locally.<sup>1</sup> And the other<sup>2</sup> Apologists hold substantially the same views of the Deity.

Though they insist that the Father is spiritual, ineffable, and nameless,<sup>3</sup> the Apologists do not sublimate divine transcendence into a negation of reality.<sup>4</sup> They relate it vitally to practical religion. God is not set entirely out of the reach of human cognizance, for He witnesses to this world by means of His Potency, the Logos, which was identified with the historical Jesus Christ. For Christians, this hypothesis made God a definite Reality, and in a personal sense the heavenly Father of every soul.

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 127:357A, 60:283B, 56:275A.

<sup>2</sup> *Theoph.* I, 3. "The appearance of God is ineffable, indescribable, invisible, incomprehensible;" He is "in his own place, wanting nothing."—II, 10; cf. ii, 22.; cf. Tatian, 4 and 5.

Cf. *Athenag.*, 10. "One God, increate, eternal, invisible, impassible, incomprehensible, illimitable, apprehended only by the mind and reason": cf. also 4, 8, 9.

<sup>3</sup> God had the names Father, Creator, Lord, etc., but these are only "designations based on His beneficence and works."—(II *Apol.*, 6:44D.)

<sup>4</sup> As does Philo (*Leg. All.*, i, 47, *Quod Deus Immut.*, 301) and other writers.

Justin becomes almost materialistic in attributing to God a "form."—(I *Apol.*, 9:57D.)

None of the Apologists speculate in advance upon current views of Deity, but, accepting these, emphasize those aspects which differentiate the Christian conception both from the crudity of polytheism, and that excessive sublimation of Deity by which God was refined away from all practical religion.

### THEORY OF DIVINE INTERMEDIATION

The doctrine of divine Intermediation as conceived by pagan philosophers of the age was a conspicuous feature of contemporary culture. But in the Christology of the Apologists, we have the Christian version of the same theory. While Tatian, Theophilus, and Athenagoras confine their statement of this hypothesis almost entirely to an account of the Logos as a metaphysical Being, Justin, though devoting much attention to the same, in addition presents the theory of the Logos in the terms of popular Christian teaching. In this writer, not only is Christ represented as the Logos—God in the Second rank, the First Principle and the Rational Potency, but also as the Incarnate Logos—the Man Jesus Christ of evangelical faith. Justin's teaching is characterized considerably by realism and anthropomorphism; however, he maintains well the balance between religious realism and speculative theory.

### FAITH AND REFLECTIVE THOUGHT

But none of the Apologists regard reflective thought itself as a menace to faith. For Christianity, considered as the true philosophy, was opposed not to logic but only to error. It did not contradict or substitute faith, but interpreted it. Doubtless, such a method could be pressed too far. That this possibility was feared is indicated by the rise of the ethical

and inspirational reaction in Montanism, wherein the simple unreflective type of mind showed its objection to that more critical spirit which was conspicuous in the thought of certain other branches of the Church. But discrepancy between faith and systematized theological doctrine is inevitable. For the more the elements of faith are reflected upon, the more will the metaphysical results of criticism tend to penetrate the substance of religion.

#### THE ADVANTAGES SECURED BY THE NEW TYPE OF DOCTRINE

Some writers<sup>1</sup> deplore the intellectualizing of religion by the Apologists, believing that thereby faith was partially subverted and degraded. But, though their philosophical statement of doctrine necessarily substituted earlier forms, the Apologists were thereby enabled to exhibit Ecclesiastical teaching as a rational system, more developed, wider in its range and in its

<sup>1</sup> E.g., Hatch, *Hibbert Lectures*; Dorner, *Person of Christ*; Harnack, *Dogma*. Tixeront (*Dogma*, vol. I, p. 219), considers that the "doctrinal inaccuracies of the Apologists have their source in their philosophy. . . . This led them to maintain erroneously the temporal generation of the Logos, as well as His subordination and inferiority, etc."

But this view is doubtless in reference to later dogmatics. In any case, it cannot be claimed that there was any general standard of orthodoxy in the second century. Nor are this writer's assertions correct, for the Apologists do not assert that the Logos was generated in "time," but "before the ages"; and his subordination to the Father is not due to his being identified with the philosophical Logos but to his being the Son, generated by the Father. See subsequent discussions, p. 120, *seq.*; p. 159, *seq.*

contact with life, yet no less pure, though more abstract ; to relate Revelational Truth to universal Truth ; to place the Personality of Christ upon a cosmical basis ; and, inferentially, to constitute the Advent of the Messiah an event in world history. Whatever be the disadvantages of the Apologetic Christology, they are compensated amply by the gains.

2.—*The Old Testament and Allegory in the Apologists*

In utilizing the allegorical method of interpretation in setting forth their Christology, the Apologists<sup>1</sup> were following a practice which had been increasing in favour among Christians for more than half a century. Especially was this method found useful by Christians in their efforts to find support in the ancient Scriptures for their views upon the Person of Christ. While certain passages in the Old Testament books readily confirmed the prevailing doctrine of the Father as to its main provisions, unless they were to be ignored in connection with the doctrine of the Son, it was necessary to apply some method of interpretation besides the literal. They therefore adopted the allegorical method, and by it were enabled so to construe many prophetical, historical, and other classes of passages as to cause them to assert what Christians wished them to mean, regardless of what might be their actual meaning. But notwithstanding

<sup>1</sup> Justin and Theophilus more particularly.



all this manipulation of the Scriptures, it must be admitted that the resulting interpretations, despite their arbitrariness, often suit remarkably well the Spirit of Biblical Revelation in general.

#### FINDING CHRIST IN THE O.T. PROPHECY

Justin and Theophilus, who of the Apologists made most frequent use of the allegorical method, regarded all Scripture as having been inspired by the Logos, the Prophetic Spirit.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, in some sense, it all applied to Him. But this theory could not be made to work without considerable difficulty. Therefore, with much care, these writers selected many passages which bore a supposed application to the Logos (though literally often irrelevant), and by the allegorical method construed them to suit their theory. For instance, Justin is found stating that the words "He shall be the desire of all nations," signify symbolically Christ's two Advents,<sup>2</sup> and that the passage "He shall send the rod of power out of Jerusalem" foretold the mighty word of Apostolic preaching.<sup>3</sup> Theophilus also appeals similarly to the Old Testament, though less often.<sup>4</sup>

#### ALLEGORY APPLIED TO O.T. HISTORY

Besides prophetic passages, the natural meaning of statements of historical fact, and of devotional

<sup>1</sup> Justin, I *Apol.*, 36; *Theoph.* II, 10:88c—"the Spirit of God."

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 52:272c.

<sup>3</sup> Justin, I *Apol.*, 48:83B; cf. 51:88B.

<sup>4</sup> E.g., II, 10, 13, 15, etc.

expressions is sometimes twisted dexterously, occasionally even discreetly ignored, in order to support a point in maintaining their theory of the Person of the Logos. The "ineffable generation" of Christ is said to be referred to in the words "His generation who shall declare";<sup>1</sup> and His Ascension into heaven in the passage "Lift up your heads, O ye gates, etc." And other examples<sup>2</sup> are abundant. Interpreted thus, the Old Testament could be caused to furnish the highest revelational authority for their doctrines. Though, in general, arbitrary and critically unsound, their method served a providential purpose in stabilizing Christian teaching in a time of heretical ferment, by founding it upon the Old Testament records, the authority of which was undisputed by the orthodox Jews, and respected even by pagans for its antiquity. Thereby, the confidence of doubters, whether Christians, Jews or pagans, was often gained. For in that age great reverence was paid to antiquity; and new doctrines, if seemingly confirmed by ancient revelation, especially by fulfilled prophecy, would be accepted readily.

<sup>1</sup>Justin, I *Apol.*, 51:86, C.D.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 140, *seq.*

## CHAPTER IV

### I.—THE CHRISTOLOGY OF JUSTIN MARTYR

#### I.—*Biographical*

##### HIS BIRTH AND LIFE PRIOR TO CONVERSION

**J**USTIN MARTYR was born at Flavia Neapolis,<sup>1</sup> a city of Samaria. In earlier life he followed some form of pagan religion,<sup>2</sup> but even as a pagan he was possessed of an earnest desire to live in a genuinely religious manner. With this purpose in view, as he relates, he applied successively to representative teachers<sup>3</sup> of the Stoic, Peripatetic and Pythagorean schools, but without satisfactory results. At length, after conversation with a Platonist, his soul received great enlightenment: he felt he had found God. But the crisis in his life had not yet happened. Subsequent to his illumination by the Platonic teaching, he came to recognize that Christianity, toward which he had been attracted by his own observation of the endurance and faith of persecuted Christians, was the "true philosophy" and the only authoritative teaching. The decisive occasion was consequent upon his interview with an aged Christian whom he acci-

<sup>1</sup> *I Apol.*, i.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 23.

<sup>3</sup> *Dial.*, 2.

dentally met strolling by the seaside. "Suddenly," he relates, "a fire was lighted in my soul, and I was possessed of a love for the prophets, and for those men who are Christ's friends; and, pondering over with myself the old man's statements, I found that this was the only secure and profitable philosophy."<sup>1</sup>

### HIS CONVERSION

In Christian teaching this inquirer after truth and righteousness found a self-consistency, and also an element of serene authority, which contrasted emphatically with the uncertainties and mutual contradictions of the various schools of philosophy with which he was familiar.

### CHRISTIAN ACTIVITIES

Where this remarkable interview took place we know not, nor have we much information concerning the Apologist's subsequent career. However, on good grounds we may venture the opinion that the remainder of his life was occupied with the activities of Christian evangelism.

### HIS MARTYRDOM

In the Second *Apology* Justin tells us that a certain Cynic philosopher in Rome, Crescens by name, was

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 8:225B; cf. Tatian—"our Barbarian philosophy" (*Oratio*, 35): cf. *Theoph.* I, 14.

plotting against him. From the fact that the Apologist suffered martyrdom a few years later, it may be assumed that his enemy succeeded in his evil course. The exact year of Justin's death is unknown, but since the *Acta S. Justinii* intimates that it took place while Junius Rusticus was Prefect of Rome, it can be dated between A.D. 163 and 167.<sup>1</sup>

### LITERARY LABOURS

Justin was the author of numerous literary works, but of the many which have been attributed to his authorship, only three can be confidently pronounced genuine. These are the First and Second *Apologies* and the *Dialogue* with Trypho the Jew. The former *Apology* was addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, having been written probably about the middle of that prince's reign—perhaps in A.D. 139<sup>2</sup>. The Second *Apology* now extant may possibly be part of the First,<sup>3</sup> the actual Second *Apology* (written perhaps in A.D. 160) having doubtless perished. All that can be said confidently as to the date of the *Dialogue* is that it was composed later than the First *Apology*.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Bardenhewer, *Patrologia*, p. 49, *seq.*

<sup>2</sup> Donaldson, *Hist. Christian Lit.*, vol. II, p. 85.

<sup>3</sup> Donaldson, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

<sup>4</sup> Donaldson, *op. cit.*—acknowledgment is here made to this able critic for some biographical details and opinions included in this section.

### HIS MORAL INFLUENCE IN THE CHURCH

Justin's influence in the early Church was considerable, and was due, not to the possession of commanding mental powers or conspicuous literary abilities (for the Apologist could hardly be credited with these), but to his sterling Christian character and earnest life. Christians never forgot his courageous defence of their fellows before the Government when arraigned upon false, malicious, and trumped-up charges.

### CRITICISM OF JUSTIN'S LITERARY STYLE AND METHOD

His earnest Christian life and his contempt for the artifice and falseness of pagan practice led him, as it did other Christians, to be rather indifferent about the niceties of literary style. Many men who had revolted from paganism considered that a too punctilious observance of rhetorical form betrayed unreality. As a consequence of this, Justin's arguments, as a whole, are not stated well; the style is often slipshod, and the argumentation lacking at times in proper arrangement and connection. But his works convince the reader that he was well educated, versed in some branches of philosophy, widely acquainted with the literature of his age, and a diligent student of the Scriptures.

### HIS RELATION TO PHILOSOPHY

Whilst his polemic leads him to attack many articles of pagan belief, he can yet pay the ancient

Greek sages the compliment of being sincere, and allow to them the possession of at least some seeds of the Truth, in anticipation of the full Revelation in Jesus Christ. Plato is his philosophical master, for whom he shows great respect. Of some of Plato's works, notably the *Timaeus* and *Apology*, he possessed intimate knowledge. These two works of Plato seem to have captivated Justin, but he gives no evidence of special interest in Plato's other and more abstract dialogues and their problems. It is Plato's suggestive idealism, his ethical and religious doctrines that win the devotion of this Apologist. However, great as is Justin's admiration for Platonism, he can accord to it only second place in his esteem, for, since he became a convert to Christianity, revealed religion had won his highest reverence. While on the one hand he accepts Christianity as the full and absolute Truth, on the other he can even believe that his former master, Plato, had borrowed some of his most illuminating and penetrating thoughts from the Mosaic<sup>1</sup> books. But at most, Plato can have possessed only a particle of the whole divine Truth. For Stoic doctrine, Justin has high esteem, that is, for its ethical sanctions. Epicureans and Cynics merely provoke his contempt. Notwithstanding, the attitude of the Apologist to pagan wisdom and life was, on the whole, conciliatory and sympathetic, though he was ready to condemn without hesitation any evil elements he perceived therein.

<sup>1</sup> I *Apol.*, 60.

### MOTIVE OF HIS WRITINGS

Justin possessed the consciousness of having a mission. Missionary zeal inspires all his writings. Even in his *Apologies* in defence of Christians accused on false charges, he is also seen to be aiming at the conversion of heathen readers to the belief that Jesus, Whom Christians worshipped, is the Divine Logos, the Son of God.

### HIS CHRISTOLOGY ORTHODOX IN PRINCIPLE

Justin's whole Christological system rests upon the basic fact that Jesus Christ is the "only proper Son of God," the unique Revealing Logos. And upon this fundamental fact, he insists with uncompromising vigour, frequency, and skill. To him, it is the primary and only real truth, any variation in principle therefrom being characterized by him as false teaching. Such heterodox theories of the Son of God as receive passing notice from him, he condemns emphatically, and attributes their origin to demoniacal inspiration. In this connection, the Marcians, Basilideans, Saturnalians, and Valentinians<sup>1</sup> come under his denunciations; also Simon Magus,<sup>2</sup> as well as certain other classes of pseudo-Christians.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 35.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 120; I *Apol.*, 26, 56.

<sup>3</sup> "Men confessing themselves Christians, and admitting the crucified Jesus to be both Lord and Christ, yet not teaching his doctrines, but those of the spirits of error," blaspheming Christ and "worshipping him only in name."—*Dial.*, 35:253D; cf. *Dial.*, 80, 82.



## DID HERESIES AFFECT JUSTIN'S OPINIONS?

But had these vagaries any appreciable effect upon the form or matter of Justin's theory of the Person of Christ? It is difficult to say precisely, though it would seem that upon him, as one of the faithful, they exerted an influence in the nature of a reflex action, which, to use his own words, caused "us who are disciples of the genuine and pure doctrine of Christ to be more steadfast and true in the hope announced of Him."<sup>1</sup> And as a consequence, in the sphere of Christian doctrinal theories, the earnest attention of Christians would have been directed more vigorously to safeguarding the treasure of Apostolic teaching.

2.—*Heathen Objections to Christ, the Son of God, and some Resemblances between Paganism and Christian Doctrine*

Whilst a Christian reasonably could have assumed an attitude of exclusive contempt towards heathen objections to Christ, some of the most enlightened and progressive Christians, more keenly alive to the missionary character of their Gospel, aimed at a possible reconciliation of their differences with Paganism, so far as doctrinal principle permitted. And with this end in view, methods, employed but tentatively in a former generation, are now applied with freedom and confidence.

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 35—see p. 77.

### CHARACTER OF PAGAN OBJECTIONS TO CHRIST

Both philosophy and allegory proved to be potent agents in reducing Christian teaching to a form likely to be acceptable to the heathen world. Nevertheless, with the pagans, on the other hand, there were destined to remain deep and radical objections to the Christian views and claims. Some of these objections were impossible to eliminate, especially those arising out of philosophical principles, or the prepossessions of popular religious cults. Of these objections the Apologists were not ignorant, as is clear from their occasional covert references thereto.<sup>1</sup> But Celsus, a Platonist, their contemporary and a competent witness of pagan culture, writes pitying Christians for their absurdity, stating that a descent of God in the flesh is impossible on philosophical grounds, and that such<sup>2</sup> a Son of God as Christ, humanly born, would be neither divine, immortal nor pure.<sup>3</sup> In a word, he asserts emphatically that "No Son of God, ye Jews and Christians, ever did or ever will come to earth."<sup>4</sup> The objections which

<sup>1</sup> E.g., Justin remarks that pagans "declare our madness, saying that we give to a crucified man a place second to the Unchangeable God, etc."—*I Apol.*, 13.

Athenagorus pleads—"Let no one think it absurd that there should be a Son of God" (10:10c.) and Tatian exclaims—"We do not act as fools, ye Greeks, nor utter idle fables, when we declare that God was born in the form of a man."—(*Oratio*, 21:159c).

<sup>2</sup> *True Word*, iv, 18, 20, 52—see also p. 81, note 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, ii, 31; vi, 72, 73.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, v, 2.

Celsus urges are the more important in their being neither isolated nor casual opinions, but such as every cultured pagan must have raised on contemporary scientific principles. Hence, the passionate assertions of faith by the Apologists referred to above.<sup>1</sup>

#### WAS MAGIC USED AS AN AGENCY?

Magic was a frequent accompaniment of divinity in the popular cults. Judging from Justin's remarks, this had been attributed to Christ by Greeks<sup>2</sup> as an explanation of his striking personality, as also it had been by Jews. But the Apologist stoutly denies the insinuation that Christ merely "by skill in magic showed that He was the Son of God," and offers proof of its falseness.<sup>3</sup> The proof which he advances, however, being based only upon Hebrew prophecy, would hardly be convincing to pagans.

#### DECEPTIVE RESEMBLANCES BETWEEN PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN NOTIONS

But again, certain resemblances are recognized between Christian and pagan teaching upon the Logos. Of these, Justin makes good use in an effort to disarm opposition against Christianity in general, and to make reply from the Christian side to specific heathen

<sup>1</sup> See note 1, p. 97.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 69.

<sup>3</sup> *I Apol.*, 30.

objections. For, when informed of the Christian Logos, pagans tended naturally to think of their myths of Zeus. The points of likeness between the two notions Justin is ready to admit, and cites for illustration the case of "Hermes" the "Interpreting Logos"; of "Aesculapius" who ascended to heaven; and of the Emperors, who are deified<sup>1</sup> when they die. He then unequivocally asserts that "if anyone objects that Christ was crucified, in this He (Christ) was not different from your supposed Sons of Zeus, who suffered" (thus being a hero at least); and that "if He (Christ) was born of a woman, ye pagans, accept this as equal to what you claim for Perseus."<sup>2</sup> But, of course, these assertions are true only in a superficial sense. "Sons of Zeus," being many, obviously could not be identified with that unique Incarnation of the Logos which Christians claimed to be the Christ. From the above resemblances, Justin, and likewise the other Apologists, pass on to show the contrasts between Hermes and Christ, and endeavour to point out that the divine Sonship of the Logos-Christ is based upon a higher plane, being distinct from the analogy of the sensuous myths. Justin would account for these similarities on the ground that Christians proclaim the true doctrine, while the heathen possess only a portion of the truth—a portion too that had been largely

<sup>1</sup> *I Apol.*, 21; *Dial.*, 69.

<sup>2</sup> *I Apol.*, 22.

falsified and corrupted by the evil influence of the daemons.<sup>1</sup>

### 3.—*Christ, the Son of God, the Logos*

A marked feature<sup>2</sup> of Justin's presentation of Christology, is the multitude of appellations attaching to Christ. Of these, the titles "Son of God" and "Logos" possess a special importance. Distinction is further made between these two titles, for primarily and at base, the Apologist conceives of Christ as the "Son"<sup>3</sup> of the Father. The significance of this distinction we shall endeavour to elucidate.

#### (a) *Christ, the "Son"*

In thus designating Christ, the Apologist follows the usage customary in the Church from New Testament times onwards. But hitherto, the meaning and significance of the term "Son" had not been defined

<sup>1</sup>I *Apol.*, 21, 22, 23. In this statement, Justin is on the verge of a great truth. For those points in the teachings of heathen cults which are in some way similar to certain elements in Christian doctrine cannot deprive Christianity of the right to exclusive claim to revealed Truth, but merely show that pagan efforts in search of Truth, at best, arrived only at approximations. (See I *Apol.*, 60; II *Apol.*, 8; *Tatian*, 2, 3, 25; *Theoph.* II, 34; III, 2, 3, 5, 7; *Athenag.*, 6, 7, 8). Further discussion on p. 133, *seq.*

<sup>2</sup>Probably Justin is influenced by Philo, wherein is a large number of descriptions of the Logos. The Stoics likewise attached many names to the Logos of their conception. *Tatian*, *Theophilus* and *Athenagoras* also have numerous titles for Logos. The philosophical reason for this usage is found in Stoicism. See p. 138.

<sup>3</sup>*υἱὸς θεοῦ*—*Dial.*, 118:346B; cf. 128:357E; cf. "the only proper Son, begotten of God."—I *Apol.*, 23:68C.

precisely. While some Christians had understood it in the Adoptionist<sup>1</sup> sense, others had referred it to the notion of a Pre-Existent Spiritual Son,<sup>2</sup> Who became Incarnate. Ebionism and Docetism also represented other views upon the same. But in Justin and the other Apologists the conception is seen to have attained already a stabilized form, which is particularly identified with the Pneumatic theory, and in addition, has received scientific definition.

#### WHAT IS IMPLIED BY THE TERM "SON"

First, the term "Son" obviously implies derivation or generation from a higher and more original Being, that is, from the Father, Whom orthodox Christians recognized as the God of the Old Testament. But, the bare statement that Christ Incarnate is the "Son" of the Eternal Father provides no explanation of the nature of His Sonship, except to indicate that the Father is the Originator. Further definition of the conception must depend upon what is assumed to be the Father's nature. We have seen that Justin<sup>3</sup> viewed God as the Personal, Supreme Being, the Transcendent Mind, Who is self-revealed in His Son. Thence it follows that the "Son" Whom He generated is in essence rational, and can be designated appropriately the "Logos."

<sup>1</sup> See ch. i.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 39.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 83.

## CHARACTER OF THIS SONSHIP

It is as the "Son" that the "Logos" "came forth"<sup>1</sup> from the Father. Him Christians worship as the "Son of the true God Himself."<sup>2</sup> The character of this Sonship was not due to any accidental qualities such as wisdom, on account of which, had He been only a man by ordinary<sup>3</sup> birth, He would have been "Worthy to be called Son of God"; nor to His possession of superlative gifts of magical power.<sup>4</sup> In no sense was His Sonship figurative, merely apparent or attributive, for it was based upon more essential grounds than simply opinion or analogy. In an exclusive sense, Christ is the pre-eminent, unique "Son." For whatever other beings may be called in a sense "Sons of God," Christ is the "only One called Son rightfully"<sup>5</sup>—that One Whom prophets "foretold as coming," "being, and being called Son<sup>6</sup> of God." No other Being had proceeded from God in the same immediate, peculiar manner. Since He was above ordinary human birth, having an "ineffable<sup>7</sup> generation," He alone is designated correctly the "First-Born" and "unique,"<sup>8</sup> and the "peculiarly<sup>9</sup> begotten, only Son." As such, He has essential

<sup>1</sup> *I Apol.*, 6:56c; cf. *Athenag.*, 10:10c.<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 13:60E.<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 22:67E; cf. *Dial.* 99:326c.<sup>4</sup> *I Apol.*, 30:72B.<sup>5</sup> *II Apol.*, 6:44D; cf. *I Apol.*, 23:68c. *Dial.*, 105:332D—see p. 99.<sup>6</sup> *I Apol.*, 31:73B.<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 51:86c; *Dial.*, 54:274A.<sup>8</sup> I.e., "first-born" and "only begotten."<sup>9</sup> *I Apol.*, 23:68c.

relationship with the Father, being His "Logos," Who in reference to the universe is "First Potency<sup>1</sup> after God," and "First Principle."<sup>2</sup>

### HIS DOCTRINE BASED ON SCRIPTURE

Despite the prominence of the philosophical elements in Justin, it is significant that, with respect to doctrinal essentials, he invariably appeals to Scripture for confirmation, not to human speculation, even that of the greatest philosophers. "For," as he inquires, "by what reason should we believe of a crucified Man, that he is the First-Born (Son) of the Ingenerate God, . . . unless we found testimonies of him "<sup>3</sup> in the Scriptures? It would seem that while Scripture reveals the identity of the Son of God, philosophy helps to define His Nature. But the Prophecies are the irrefragable evidence—"being written for the sake of proving that Jesus is Christ, the Son of God, His Apostle, being from former ages, the Logos."<sup>4</sup>

### THE SON DISTINCT FROM THE FATHER

Since the Offspring of the Father is naturally the Son, a Person, He is distinct from the Father individually<sup>5</sup>—a fact which renders false the theories of Modalistic speculators "who assert that the Son is the Father," or is related to the Father as a "ray of

<sup>1</sup> *I Apol.*, 32:74c.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 61:284A.

<sup>3</sup> *I Apol.*, 53:88A.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 63:96A.

<sup>5</sup> Justin, *Dial.*, 62:285D; cf. *Athenag.*, 12:12D—ἐν ῥάξει.



light is to the sun," for such innovators "are proved neither to have known the Father . . . nor the Son."<sup>1</sup>

#### BASIC SIGNIFICANCE OF TERM SON

In a remarkable Christological passage,<sup>2</sup> Justin inserts the term "Son" as one in a series of designations of Christ given by the Spirit, some philosophical, others scriptural and allegorical, from neither of which does he herein distinguish it. Thus, unless its basic importance were indicated elsewhere, it would appear to have no more weight or significance than "Wisdom," "Potency," "Lord," etc. But upon this designation, upon its meaning and implications, all other titles, even "Logos," evidently depend.

#### (b) *Christ, "the Logos"*

Throughout his extant genuine works Justin represents Christ very frequently under the distinctive designation, "the Logos," He is the "Logos" in virtue of His being the unique "Son" of the Eternal Father. The philosophic implications of the above term having been briefly referred to already<sup>3</sup>, it now remains for us to study it in its Christological applications in Justin. The term "Logos" was adopted from current philosophy as being the only expression

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 128, and 56—while in the *Apologies* the term "Son" is frequent, in the *Dialogue* it occurs seldom, and generally has reference to the Incarnate life, e.g., "the Son born," "the holy Thing begotten of her (Mary) is the Son of God."—*Dial.*, 34:251E.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 61:284, A-B.

<sup>3</sup> See preface.

which suitably and comprehensively represented the metaphysical and spiritual elements in the nature of the Son of God. But since the same Logos becomes the Incarnate Christ, Justin shows that His human nature is involved also in the same conception. The Christian Logos is therefore also the "Man," or rather the "God-Man," the "Spiritual Son" Incarnated, in Whom are found all human qualities in purity and fullness, as well as those that are divine. While at times the Apologist is more inclined to emphasize the abstract significance<sup>1</sup> of the Logos, in many other places he is seen to evince predominant interest in His manhood. However, occasionally, even in the same sentence, he incidentally touches upon both these aspects<sup>2</sup> of Christ's Person; though he never attempts to raise the philosophical question of the Dual Nature.

#### LOGOS THE REVEALER OF THE FATHER

Especially did Justin aim at describing Christ as the "Revealer" of the Invisible and Unknowable Father. The ability of Christ as the Revealer would appeal powerfully to minds trained in Greek science, wherein correct knowledge was valued so highly.

<sup>1</sup> E.g., *Dial.*, 61:284A.B.C.; 128:357-8, etc. Justin uses the term Logos to signify the Intermediary position of Jesus, Son of God, the Christ. Jesus is divine and human, the Logos of God; not divine Son because He is the Logos, but Logos because He is the absolute, unique, God the Son.

<sup>2</sup> E.g., I *Apol.*, 21:66E, 23:68C, etc.

For who could be imagined to be more fully qualified to make an adequate Revelation of divine knowledge than the very Word, the Uttered Reason of the Supreme? If Christ be what Christians claim for Him—the very Son of the Eternal Father, then He is naturally God's perfect Revealer *par excellence*.

#### PAGAN ANTICIPATIONS OF LOGOS

The Christian Logos had its antecedents in other modes of thought. In his First *Apology*, Justin refers to certain foregleams in paganism of the Christian Logos. For instance, Hermes, a familiar figure in pagan mythology, is the "interpreting Logos and teacher."<sup>1</sup> On the analogy of Hermes, Christ is Logos, "for by Him the commands of the Father were announced to men."<sup>2</sup> Other anticipations of the Logos of the Apologists are found in the Old Testament "Word of God" and the "Wisdom" of God. But St. John<sup>3</sup> had gathered up the essential elements contained in these notions in his conception of Logos—the Father's Revealer and Agent in the Creation. And the Sub-Apostolic writers<sup>4</sup> utilized these scriptural conceptions of Christ with more or less definiteness, in their efforts to express their conviction that He is the Pre-Existing Revealing Word of God, become Incarnate.

<sup>1</sup> I *Apol.*, 21:67A; 22:67E. See p. 99.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 128:358A; cf. *Theoph.* I, 7:74A, Cornutus, *De Nat. Deo*, 16.

<sup>3</sup> St. John, i, 1.

<sup>4</sup> See ch. I.

## DEVELOPMENT IN JUSTIN

Justin's Christological views mark a further stage in the development of the notion of a divine Revealing Word, combining with the foregoing traditional ideas certain philosophical elements. The resulting conception is considerably more definite and comprehensive than any of its predecessors.<sup>1</sup>

## JUSTIN'S OBJECTIVE

On the assumption that the Son of God is the Logos, the Apologist attempts to prove by philosophical principles (which he uses to interpret scripture teaching), Christ's Divine Nature, His place in the Godhead, His age-long and universal operations in His capacity as Spermatic Logos, His pre-eminent position in the economy of the Cosmos, and His pre-existent life with the Father from eternity.

But it is evident that the basic Christological doctrines do not arise from the identifying of the Son of God with the philosophical Logos. They are traditional and founded upon scriptural authority. Since the Logos in Justin is presented under many

<sup>1</sup> Since Justin's Logos, at least a philosophical conception, is identified with the Man Jesus Christ (quite regardless of any philosophical sanction for the actual personalizing of the Logos, and especially for identifying him with a man), the character of the theory of the Person of Christ is henceforth changed. For whenever the emphasis is laid upon the incarnate nature of Christ, the Christian Logos lays aside its speculative character; and on the other hand, when the emphasis falls upon His being Divine Logos, the notion of the Son of God inclines to the character of a metaphysical conception.

aspects, we shall consider these under the following sectional heads.

(1) *The Generation of the "Logos-Son"*

That the Logos, in some sense, *began to be* is the universal Christian belief in the second century. But the theory of the "eternal generation" of the Logos gains no notice at all in our Apologists.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, these writers are unanimous in ascribing to the divine Logos a "generation," that is a "beginning" in a definite sense. And yet there is involved even in this notion too at least a verbal contradiction, for, according to the philosophy of the time, Divine Essence, which is the nature of Logos, cannot, as such, have derivation and beginning.

#### GENERATION IS NOT SIMPLY ORIGATION

Justin's conception of the "generation" of Logos indicates not an origination *ab initio*, but the hypos-tatization of the Logos, which, because of the limitations of human thought and language, was necessarily viewed as an *event*. By his "generation," there was involved a change in the relationship of Logos to the Father and to the created world. Therefore, for the Logos, there was in fact a "beginning," or in Tertul-lian's crude statement "Fuit tempus cum filius non fuit,"<sup>2</sup> which, in the sense intimated above, is true.

<sup>1</sup> Unless possibly in II *Apol.*, 6:44D—see p. 121, note 1. This theory was first clearly stated by Origen (*de Princip.*, I, 2, 4).

<sup>2</sup> *Hermog.*, 3.

But, though the term "Son" itself necessitates the notion of an origination, there is no obligation to reason like Arius that, because He was begotten of the Father, the Son is a "creature," for unlike a creature, His "birth" was of the nature of an emanation into hypostasis from the unchangeable Divine Essence, without change as to essence in Himself.<sup>1</sup>

#### LOGOS THE SAME IN ESSENCE BEFORE AND AFTER GENERATION

Tixeront's<sup>2</sup> remark that generation caused a "change in the inner being of the Logos," is undoubtedly erroneous. For since "Logos" is "Reason" essentially and totally,<sup>3</sup> any departure from the rational would cause Him to approximate to the irrational, which Logos cannot be. But His generation certainly involved a change of some description. And, since it could not have taken place "in His inner being," it must then have concerned His external relationship and phenomenal life, that is, His character as a Divine Person. In many passages<sup>4</sup> Justin

<sup>1</sup> Being Logos in the divine nature before "utterance" (*Dial.*, 61:284B), he is no more, and no less, Logos after utterance.

<sup>2</sup> *Dogma*, vol. I, p. 236.

<sup>3</sup> II *Apol.*, 8:46D. "the whole Logos . . . Christ."

*Ibid.*, 10:48B—"the whole rational principle became Christ." Tixeront's error is apparently due to want of sympathy with the philosophical teaching of the period, in which the Apologists were versed.

<sup>4</sup> E.g., I *Apol.*, 5, 12, 13, 23, 32, 33, 46, 53, 63, etc. II *Apol.*, 6, 8, 10, 13. *Dial.*, 23:241B, 54:274A; 76:301A, 84:310B; 85:311B, etc.

indicates his appreciation of the distinction between the generation of Christ as the Logos of the Father, and His birth as Man. Though in both cases the Son or Logos is said to have been "begotten," it is clear that the first is considered to be an "intelligible" generation, but the second a natural birth.

### JUSTIN'S CONCEPTION OF GENERATION OF LOGOS

For a discussion of Justin's views upon the generation of the Logos, a useful point of departure is found in the passage, viz.: "Jesus Christ was begotten of God, only Son in a peculiar sense, being His Logos, the First-Begotten and Potency."<sup>1</sup> In this statement it is taught that His origin is in God, His generation is singular, peculiar and primary, and that as "Son," He is likewise Logos and Potency. Elsewhere he is called "First Potency after God the Father"<sup>2</sup>—derivation being indicated in the phrase "after God."

### LOGOS SECOND IN RANK

The very fact that Logos is "generated," being the "First-born to the Ingenerate<sup>3</sup> God," places Him in striking contrast with God Who is entirely uncaused, both as to personality and essence. As the "originated" Divine Being, Justin assigns to Logos "Second Place," once even on the high authority of Plato,<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *I Apol.*, 23:68c; *μόνος ἰδίως υἱός* cf. 46:83c; *Dial.*, 105:332D.

<sup>2</sup> *I Apol.*, 32:74B; cf. 33:75C.

<sup>3</sup> *I Apol.*, 53:88A; 58:92B.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 60:93C.

and again when enumerating the Persons of the Trinity.<sup>1</sup>

#### LOGOS A METAPHYSICAL PRINCIPLE AND DIVINE

In the *Dialogue* our Apologist advances some important scientific statements upon the Logos. Therein he asserts that what God generated was really a "First Principle, a certain Rational Potency,"<sup>2</sup> which issued "before all creatures." We have not had it stated quite so plainly that Divine Energy produced "Reason." For usually the term "Logos" combines the notion of the Revealing Word with that of Reason, and consequently, the notion of the absoluteness of the element of pure reason comprised in the conception is to that extent diluted. But here, Logos is referred to in the abstract sense; it is a metaphysical "principle," a cosmic force, and pure reason. For, since God is pure, eternal, absolute Mind,<sup>3</sup> what type of Being could He generate but a Rational<sup>4</sup> Being? And since, according to Stoic<sup>5</sup> teaching, the self-expression of Mind is rational speech or "logos," therefore the Son or Being Whom God generates must be the Divine Logos or Rational Word. But whether the generated Being be called

<sup>1</sup> I *Apol.*, 13:60E.

<sup>2</sup> ἀρχὴν . . . δύναμιν τινὰ . . . λογικὴν—*Dial.*, 61:284A.

<sup>3</sup> νοῦς—see Donaldson, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 218.

<sup>4</sup> Rational, that is signifying the essence or nature, not as with man in a partial, attributive sense.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Dial.*, 61:284B; Tatian, 5:145C.



Angel, Wisdom, Logos, Potency, Son, Lord, or God, since it proceeded "out of God<sup>1</sup>" reduced to its essence, it can be but "Reason." From this conclusion, it follows that the generating Mind and the "Offspring" are of identical essence or nature, and that the latter, being therefore Divine essentially, in fact, is "God."<sup>2</sup>

#### EXPLANATIONS OF NATURE OF LOGOS

Judging from the context, Justin would seem to have realized how enigmatical to his Jewish auditors in the *Dialogue* were the statements that God<sup>3</sup> brought forth the "First Principle" and "Rational Potency." He therefore attempts to explain by metaphors taken from current philosophy the manner of such generation. It was an intelligible generation. Thereby, the intelligible Essence of the Divine Mind entered into phenomenal existence as a Being, as the Logos Hypostatic. He considers that the subject here demanding explanation is not concerned with the Reason within the Divine Mind but with the utterance in speech of that Reason—that is, of the "thought" which the Mind generates. Taking the human mind as an example, he proceeds to explain thus—"When we give out some rational word,<sup>4</sup> we bring reason<sup>5</sup> into external existence." That is to say, the reason-

<sup>1</sup> ἐξ αὐτοῦ—see note 2, p. 111.

<sup>2</sup> I.e., to them, the God of the O.T.

<sup>3</sup> λόγον γεννώμεν. *Dial.*, 61:284B

<sup>2</sup> See p. 162

<sup>4</sup> λόγος.

ing power in the mind, hitherto unexpressed, generates an "offspring" in the form of the rational speech by which thought is uttered. Thus, the Reason in the Father becomes His Potency, or Son, the dynamic product of His Mind by which He expresses His will. Elsewhere we are told that the "whole Rational Principle became Christ."<sup>1</sup> There is no question of the original of the "Rational Principle," for it already is, but only of its hypostatization. And, further,<sup>2</sup> the Apologist continues (using another metaphor), if a fire is lit from a fire which already exists, a new fire thereby resulting, generation is again illustrated. Both metaphors are intended to elucidate the prolation and hypostatization of the Divine Essence in the Logos. For, since neither the mind which expresses rational speech, nor the fire which lights a second fire, is in any sense diminished by this apparent self-propagation, neither is the Eternal Mind lessened by its generation of the Logos. Again, since between the spoken rational word and the reasoning mind, and between the first fire and the second, there is no severance of "essence," neither is there when the Father generates the Logos, His Son, from Himself. And as both the spoken rational word and the fire lit from the first, can be said to have existence independent and separate from their originals respectively, likewise, after His generation, the Logos exists individual and separate from the Father. By these

<sup>1</sup> *II Apol.*, 10:48B.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 61:284B; cf. Tatian, 5:145C.

principles, it is established that, through generation, Logos is in no sense either a creature<sup>1</sup> or something made,<sup>2</sup> for between creature and Creator, there is difference of essence, but He is the "Divine Logos-Son," identical in essence with the Father Who generated Him. When designated the "First Principle," "Potency," "Offspring," "Wisdom," reference is made to His "Essence"; while regarded as the "Son," "Lord," etc., attention is more particularly called to His Personality. But these two aspects are combined in the total view of Christ, the Divine Revelational Logos-Son.

#### GENERATION OF LOGOS BY WILL OF FATHER

In certain passages,<sup>3</sup> Justin makes use of expressions which savour of the emanational hypothesis. But he is no mere emanationist. He adheres most closely to New Testament doctrine, and in the matter of the generation of the Son, places the emphasis upon the Divine Will<sup>4</sup> as the determining factor. The Christian Logos is not an emanation, resulting

<sup>1</sup> κτίσις.

<sup>2</sup> ποίησις.

<sup>3</sup> *Dial.*, 62:285B; 76:301B; 128 and 56.

<sup>4</sup> "Generated out of the Will of the Father."—*Dial.*, 61:284; cf. *Dial.*, 100:327C. "Generated from the Father by His power and will"—cf. *Dial.*, 128:358C.

Semisch (Justin, vol. II, p. 185) states that Logos, considered as uttered by the Father, is called the ἐργασία of God. But this opinion is based on the reading of the text of Maranus, viz.: τοῦ λογοῦ which Otto changes into τῶν λόγων—See Otto's note, *Dial.*, 114:341E, where ἐργασία is not a designation of Logos.

from pure metaphysical necessity, but the determinate result or product of the operation of the Will of the Eternal Father. The generation of the Logos was, therefore, not of necessity; nor was it fortuitous, nor automatic, but absolutely only by the free volition of the Father. In connection with this latter assertion, Justin implies that the change in relationship between the Father and the Logos, after the Logos was generated, did not arise from disunion of any kind between them, but was due to the predetermination of the Father, with Whose will the Son is necessarily in perfect and essential agreement.<sup>1</sup> For this and other reasons, referred to above, the generation of the Logos was without precedent. For as Justin states, He was "uniquely brought into being to the Father"<sup>2</sup>; He was "peculiarly begotten"; He was "projected from the Father,"<sup>3</sup> an "Offspring." And still another expression is used by the Apologist for the generation or hypostatization of the Son in the passage—"He proceeded<sup>4</sup> from the Father." That is to say that the

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 56:276E, etc.

<sup>2</sup> *μονογενής*—*Dial.*, 105:332D; cf. *Dial.*, 61:284C; cf. II *Apol.*, 6:44D; *Dial.*, 129:359B.

The term monogenes intimates that his generation was without parallel, being the only one of its kind. The usual translation "only begotten" is not strictly correct, and is due, probably, to a confusing of *γίγνομαι* with *γεννάω*. As an equivalent for the Greek term, this rendering would seem to be less appropriate than for any other "only son" of a family.

<sup>3</sup> *προβληθέν*.—*Dial.*, 62:285E.

<sup>4</sup> *προελθόντα*.—*Dial.*, 100:327C.

Cf. I *Apol.*, 6:56C; cf. *Athenag.*, *Supplic.*, 10:10C; cf. Tatian, 5: 145C.

Logos, Who ever was with God, being the Divine Essence, simply proceeded into phenomenal being, not *sua sponte*, but by the Father's will.

(2).—*The Personality of the Logos*

Philo's Logos, in respect to Personality, is anomalous, being sometimes truly personal, while at other times merely a metaphysical abstraction.<sup>1</sup> But Justin hesitates in no such uncertainty, for he is entirely convinced that Logos, the Pre-existent Son, is also Jesus Christ Who was incarnate as Man among men.

The identification of these two, the Logos and Jesus Christ, made first perhaps by St. John,<sup>2</sup> settled finally for Christians the question of the Personality of the Logos. With this fact in mind, we can both appraise at their true value the abstract metaphysical terms applied to the Logos, e.g., "Reason," "First Principle," "rational Potency"; "Offspring" and "Wisdom"; (besides many other terms applied allegorically), and can contrast them with the purely personal titles,<sup>3</sup> such as "Son," "Lord," "God," "Angel."

#### THE PURELY PHILOSOPHICAL LOGOS NOT PERSONAL

But the term Logos as used in the philosophical schools had never been actually personalized. And,

<sup>1</sup> See Drummond, *Philo*, vol. II, p. 223, *seq.*

<sup>2</sup> St. John, i, 1. St. Paul had the conception, but refrained from applying the term to Christ.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 138, *seq.*, and p. 227, *seq.*

moreover, in those types even of Christian thought which maintained more intimate relationship with current philosophy, Logos still remained a mere metaphysical conception—"a Potency indivisible, inseparable from the Father, like light" which springs from and depends upon the sun.<sup>1</sup> This view of Logos, which Justin combats, resembles closely the Modalism of Praxeas, Noetus, and Sabellius, of which it may have been a precursor.<sup>2</sup> But to whatever type of thought these views be attributable, it is evident that a certain heretical opinion regarded the Logos as neither a Person, nor even a hypostasis, but as a mere mode of divine activity.

### JUSTIN'S LOGOS A PERSON

On the other hand, so persuaded is Justin of the necessity of belief in the Personality of the Logos, that he declares those who state that the "Son is the Father, are proved neither to have been informed of the Father . . . nor of the Son."<sup>3</sup> Indeed, so truly is Logos an individual, real Being, that "He is not

*Dial.*, 128:358c.

<sup>1</sup> But Harnack (*Dogma*, vol. I, p. 187) considers the reference here is to certain philosophical Jews, who adhered to Philo's opinion that the relations of Logos with God were similar to those of the rays of light to the sun.—(*De Somn.*, I, 13.)

<sup>2</sup> I *Apol.*, 63:93c. The above heretical opinion held that "in this way (i.e., as a ray of light from the sun) God made the angels." But Justin affirms that among angels, some have permanent form, of whom the Logos, who he claims is called Angel in scripture, is the foremost example.

reckoned in name only, like the light of the sun, but is something different<sup>1</sup> from the Father in number." Distinction from the Father being a prime necessity for the existence of the Logos as a Person, Justin expressly maintains this hypothesis in many other passages.<sup>2</sup> Again, when scripture records that God, having determined upon Creation, said "Let us make man," and subsequently delivered the opinion—"Adam is become like one of us," it is declared that "there is a certain number of Persons associated with each other . . . at least two,"<sup>3</sup> of Whom the Apologist wished to prove, One was the Logos.<sup>4</sup> He adds further matter also in proof of the Personality of the Logos by citing passages from the Old Testament which record what he recognizes as certain appearances of the Son of God to the patriarchs.<sup>5</sup> In these passages Logos is designated "the Angel," because He ministered to the Father's will.<sup>6</sup> Such activity of "the Angel" or Logos involved the performance of personal acts, and must therefore constitute Him a Person. Personality is implied also very explicitly in certain passages occurring in the *Dialogue*, viz. : "the Logos Who was present with Him . . . when He created and arranged all things by Him,"<sup>7</sup> and "the

<sup>1</sup> ἀριθμῷ ἕτερον.—*Dial.*, 128:358c; cf. *Dial.*, 129:359B.

<sup>2</sup> E.g., *Dial.*, 62:285D. "God conversed with Someone who was different in number from Himself and also a rational Being."

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Dial.*, 56:276E; 58:280C; 60:283A.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 62, 127; also 58, 75, 76, etc.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 127.

<sup>7</sup> *II Apol.*, 6:44D.

Father communes<sup>1</sup> with Him." Logos considered as simply a faculty of the Divine Mind could be said, perhaps, to be "present with" the Father, but personal Being is definitely asserted when the Logos is of such nature and character that He can co-operate with the Creator and the Creator can commune with Him. Once more, Personality is ascribed to the Logos equally with the Father, viz.: "when scripture states 'the Lord rained fire out of heaven from the Lord,' the prophetic word indicates that there were two in number, one upon the earth . . . and another in heaven, the latter of whom is also Lord of the Lord on earth, Father and God."<sup>2</sup> Such a statement excludes all doubt as to the Personality of the Logos.

#### PERSONALITY OF LOGOS BEGINS WITH GENERATION

Justin recognizes that the existence of Logos as a Personality is not from all eternity but only from the moment of His generation by the Father. We have seen that Logos is the hypostasis of the rational Essence of the Father. While that Essence itself is eternal, it can be said to constitute the Logos as a personal Being only after His utterance from the Father. This point the Apologist carefully illustrates by the Stoic<sup>3</sup> metaphor of the utterance in speech of the

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 62:285E.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 129:358E.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 61:284B. But in *Athenag.* the Logos is God's Son from all eternity—see p. 226, note 2.



thought already in the Mind. Since thought becomes speech when uttered, so the Reason or Thought of God becomes the hypostatic Logos, the Personal Son, only consequent upon its being generated.

### 3.—*When was the Logos Begotten?*

It has been shown already that the generation of the Logos-Son represented a new departure in the manner of His existence. For, if the Father is ἀγένετος and the Son πρωτοτόκος, then, conceivably in the order of thought, "Fuit tempus cum Filius non fuit."<sup>1</sup>

Though it be convenient to inquire, When did the generation of Logos eventuate? the question in these temporal terms is not stated quite correctly. For the "event," if rightly so called, is said to have taken place "before things created"—before time, and not in the sequence of time. Therefore, practically speaking, it "happened" in eternity. But it cannot be called an "eternal generation," since that notion was unknown to Justin.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Tertullian, *Hermog.*, 3.

<sup>2</sup> However, Mr. Blunt (Intro. to Justin's *Apologies*) considers that the "phase *συνὸν καὶ γεννώμενος* (II *Apol.*, 6:44D) expresses the same idea as Origen in eternal generation. It implies that He who is with the Father is still in process of being begotten, and that this was the state of things before creatures were made."

If this be Justin's real meaning, it is strange that he does not indicate it in his many other statements upon the generation of the Logos. Supposing Mr. Blunt's view correct, it is evident that Justin has not realized the significance of "eternal generation" sufficiently to commit himself to it as a rule. But, I believe, the probability is that he never had the notion at all.

Newman, J. H., in his *Unadvisable Terms* notes that while Justin

The most precise statements he provides are—"His Son . . . being present with Him and begotten before created things, when in the beginning He created and arranged all things by Him,"<sup>1</sup> etc., and "begotten absolutely before all creatures."<sup>2</sup> But it is incorrect to interpret the "before" in these passages as equal to "just before," as it were "in connection with," or "as part of" the creative activity, as does Semisch.<sup>3</sup> The Apologist nowhere states that Logos was begotten "at Creation." Undoubtedly, Justin's phrase is indefinite, and if interpreted in a temporal sense, may indicate a period of any conceivable length. But since it refers to an "event" prior to time itself, to apply to it a temporal meaning rigidly, can lead only to confusion of thought.

### THE PRECISE MEANING OF TERMS

Referring to the former of the two passages cited above, much difficulty has been heaped up around the word "begotten,"<sup>4</sup> largely through requiring from nowhere definitely teaches the eternal generation of the Son, he does not exclude that idea. However, I object to Newman's phrase "temporal generation," as applied to Logos, as misleading. None of the Apologists teach a "temporal generation" of the Son. Logos is generated "before the creation," and none of the Apologists are confused as to the meaning of this phrase. Some critics give the Apologists scant credit for either common sense, learning or intelligence.

<sup>1</sup> II *Apol.*, 6:44D

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 129:359B; cf. *Dial.*, 62:258B, 84:310B, 100:326E.

<sup>3</sup> *Justin*, vol. II, p. 181. If Justin had meant "just before," he would have written γεννηθεις; cf. Blunt, *op. cit.*

<sup>4</sup> II *Apol.*, 6:44D.

Justin greater precision in the use of terms than is his habit. If the *γεννώμενος* is read as being temporarily dependent upon the *ὅτε* which follows, there results the interpretation that Logos was uttered "at" Creation. But this would be consequent upon the misunderstanding<sup>1</sup> of *συνών*, that is, in giving it the reference to the "Internal" Logos. But on the other hand, if *συνών* is taken as meaning simply the association with the Father of that Being Who was *γεννώμενος* already, then the difficulty in the interpretation of both *γεννώμενος* and *ὅτε* vanishes.

Donaldson would surmount the difficulty by referring *ὅτε* to *Χριστός* believing that "the main object of the sentence is to give an explanation of the word 'Christ' and not of 'Logos'"; *συνών* and *γεννώμενος* being inserted simply to qualify *λόγος*." While there is merit in this opinion, we, however, incline to the view that the intention is rather to explain the significance of the term "Son," towards which the whole of the sentence seems to be directed, the terms "Father" and "Son" being contrasted in the previous sentence. And if both *συνών* and *γεννώμενος*, though descriptive immediately of Logos, refer back to Son, our interpretation advanced above, will be found to be well supported.

The expressions "begotten," "First-Offspring," "projected," etc., bear reference as much to the Son's relationship to the Father as they do to His

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 125, 127.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. Christian Lit.*, Vol. II, p. 220.

generation. And further, in stating that the Son was *γεννώμενος*, Justin is thinking more of the manner in which the Son came to be than of the period in which generation eventuated. We cannot agree that the inference can be drawn from a combination of *συνών* and *γεννώμενος* with the phrase *πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων* that eternal generation<sup>1</sup> is meant. The actual utterance of Logos, as Justin often states, took place simply anterior to Creation.<sup>2</sup> This is the teaching he finds in scripture, where it is asserted that a Divine Being was "begotten before the morning star"<sup>3</sup> of Whom Justin remarks: "This is Christ, Who was begotten before<sup>4</sup> the morning star and the moon." Therefore, it is clear that before the Creation the Logos was already the Son Begotten, and when it eventuated, He took part in it as such.

#### 4—*The Pre-Existence of the Logos*

That the Incarnate Son of God had in some sense a Pre-Existence, was the general belief of Christians from Apostolic<sup>5</sup> times. Perhaps the belief which enjoyed widest acceptance was that the Son's pre-existent life was both spiritual and personal. This opinion is of

<sup>1</sup> See p. 120, note 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 61:284A-D; 62:285D-E; II *Apol.*, 6:44D, etc.

<sup>3</sup> *Dial.*, 63:286E.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 45:264A; cf. 76:302B.; cf. Prov., viii, 22.—"The Lord made me the Beginning of His ways for His works," see *Dial.*, 61:284B.

<sup>5</sup> See ch. I. Dorner (*Pers. of Ch.*, Div. I, vol. i, p. 160) states that "The opinion that the early Church was largely Ebionitic is untenable." The pneumatic view of Christ was widely held.

great importance in view of the development of the Theory of the Person of Christ in the Apologists.

Justin shows no hesitancy in attributing to the Son a full personal existence before His Incarnation, as the Spiritual Son, designating Him the Logos—the Divine Reason in hypostatic life. However, Pre-Existence of the Logos in Justin is only relatively eternal, beginning as we found, when Logos is generated of the Father.

Two periods in the Pre-Existent life of the Logos—Christ are noticed by Justin, viz. : first, when Logos was with the Father before the Creation; and second, when Logos acted as the Creative Agent, and later, as the Mediator of the divine providential government of the world, carrying out His dispensational acts, and in the "Christophanies," or again, from the metaphysical standpoint, as the "Seminal Logos" operating in the hearts of men. These two aspects we now discuss.

#### (a) *The Pre-Existence before the Creation*

Perhaps the most informing passages in Justin relating to the pre-creational life of the generated Logos are the following: "But this Offspring,<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 62:285E, cf. "He proceeded from the Father before all creatures."—*Dial.*, 100:327C. "His Logos, the first-begotten and Potency."—*I Apol.*, 23:68C; cf. 32:74C.

Cf. "The Lord made me in the Beginning of His ways for His Works" (*Prov.*, viii, 22), which Justin metamorphosed into "God generated from Himself a First Principle, a certain Rational Potency, before all creatures" (*Dial.*, 61:284A), thus expressing a scriptural statement in current philosophical terms.

Which was truly projected of the Father, was with the Father before all created things; and with Him the Father communes"; and "the Logos<sup>1</sup> was with Him, when He created and arranged all things through Him." The inference in general from these passages is that Christ's pre-existent life was real and rational, for since the Father "communes with Him," Logos must have dwelt with the Father in a personal sense, otherwise the Apologist's language is not to be taken seriously. But Justin refrains from venturing into speculation upon the nature of the pre-creational<sup>2</sup> life of the uttered Logos, except so far as he imagines he has scriptural support and sanction.

#### DISCUSSION OF TERMS

In the second passage cited above, the crucial question centres around the interpretation of the term *συνών*. Does it imply merely the immanence of the Logos in the Father, as God's Reason before its utterance, or does it refer to the association of the hypostatized Logos with the Father before the Creation, as One Divine Being with Another? The word *συνεῖναι*, when applied to persons, signifies in classical

<sup>1</sup> II *Apol.*, 6:44D.

<sup>2</sup> When arguing with Trypho he uses *προϋπάρχειν* to pre-exist (*Dial.*, 48:267D), but does not apply it to his more scientific Christological opinions.

usage "intercourse with."<sup>1</sup> Plato speaks of guests at a banquet as "being unable to have intercourse with each other over their cups."<sup>2</sup> If the classical usage of this word holds in the passage cited from Justin, then the Logos referred to cannot be the "Internal" Logos. And again, mere propriety of language would render it absurd, in a plain statement of doctrine, to speak of God as being "present with" or "having intercourse with" a Logos which is just an attribute or faculty of His Mind. We therefore consider that, by the use of *συνών*, Justin intends to indicate a personal intercourse between the Father and the Son. For in this sentence the Logos is represented as performing a function in the work of Creation which can be ascribable only to a personal Being; and elsewhere,<sup>3</sup> in a passage in which the Apologist is endeavouring to prove the personal, individual existence of the Logos as distinct from the Father's, he asserts that the words "Let us make man" were addressed by the Creator to the Logos—thus implying that

<sup>1</sup> L. and S. Lex.: "to be with," "take part with." Philo represents his Logos as in relation with the Father, in a way analogous to that of Justin's Logos. He imagines "the Divine Logos placed in the closest proximity to the truly existing God, there being no bordering interval between" (*de Profug.*, 19). Here the Philonian Logos is a hypostasis identical with the divine nature. So he is with God in closest proximity. Since Logos is the uttered Reason or Thought, of the divine Mind, there could be no interval between him and the Mind itself.

<sup>2</sup> Plato, *Protag.*, 347C; cf. Justin, *Dial.*, 62:258D. "A certain number of divine Persons associated together."

<sup>3</sup> *Dial.*, 62:285D.

Logos, even before the Creation, possessed hypostatic life.

#### OPINIONS OF CRITICS VARY

However, upon the significance of Justin's language the opinions of critics differ. For Otto<sup>1</sup> takes the *συνών* as meaning that Logos is an "attributum divinum, i.e. tamquam eius mens, λόγος ἐνδιάθετος." And Semisch<sup>2</sup> holds a similar opinion, viz.: that the "Immanence of Logos as a property, and its coming forth as a hypostasis, as well as the eternal ante-mundane existence of Logos, are expressed already" in both the passages cited above. And he adds further that the "words and ideas of *συνεῖναι* and *γεννάσθαι* form a contrast. Upon this contrast rests the truth of the representation given in the text. The *συνεῖναι*, by the clause *πρὸ πάντων τῶν ποιημάτων* is set beyond all time. The *γεννάσθαι* is placed so nearly contemporary with Creation that it "approaches time itself," and this term is the "regular analogical speculative modus under which Justin represents the becoming of the individuality or personality of the divine Logos. The *συνεῖναι* is not personal, and applies only to property." Our reply to Semisch's statement is that while verbally it is a plausible explanation of the passage from the II *Apology*, it does not suit the passage from the *Dialogue*. For, in

<sup>1</sup> Otto, note to Justin, II *Apol.*, 6:44D.

<sup>2</sup> *Justin*, Vol. II, p. 181.



the latter, the Offspring is first described as "projected"<sup>1</sup>; and then follows the expression *συνῆν*<sup>2</sup> without any reference to Logos as an attribute of the Supreme Divine Person.

But Donaldson<sup>3</sup> differs from Otto and Semisch, in asserting that "*συνών* is not the proper word for an attribute, *ἐνών* or *προσών* being used for it; and *συνεῖμι* implies 'existence along with,' and therefore, separate distinct existence." And Dorner doubts if *συνεῖναι* can mean the "being of an attribute in God." "What writer," he asks, "would so speak of an attribute? How can the assertion be justified that with Justin, the Reason is but an attribute?"<sup>4</sup> Finally, Scott Holland<sup>5</sup> thinks that either of the above interpretations may be applied to Justin's language.

#### JUSTIN'S PROBABLE MEANING

The safest guide to the meaning of the term, probably, will be found in the general teaching of the Apologist. He manifests no special interest in the Logos before utterance. Indeed, not only would it have served no practical purpose in his system, but he would have viewed any expression of opinion upon the activity of Logos, when immersed in the secrecy of the eternal Essence of the Deity, as mere specula-

<sup>1</sup> *προβληθέν*.

<sup>2</sup> "Being present with the Father," cited *supra*.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. Christ. Lit.*, vol. II, p. 222.

<sup>4</sup> *Person of Christ*, Div. I, vol. I, p. 270.

<sup>5</sup> Art. "Justin" in Smith and Wace. (*Dict. Ch. Biog.*)

tion, indeed presumptuous speculation, since Scripture gave no countenance to the view. Not until God's Reason is generated into individual existence, does Justin consider it within the range of human thought. But particularly from the moment in which He begins the work of Creation, the Logos becomes of superlative interest to man. When the Apologist is illustrating the generation of the Logos by the Stoic<sup>1</sup> notion of the rational word, nearly the whole of his interest and the entire aim of his argument are directed to the "uttered" Reason, not the reasoning faculty internal in the mind.

His use of the above expressions are instances of slight attempts Justin makes to construe the Logos in a manner at variance with his general custom. However, he does not linger long in the rare atmosphere of this tentative speculation, but reverts very soon to the level of Scripture and experimental religion.

(b) *Pre-Existence Subsequent to the Creation*

The terms "First-begotten and Potency"<sup>2</sup> applied to Logos in reference to his pre-creational existence, are also used of his post-creational life, antecedent to His Incarnation. The Creation is merely an incident in the Logos-life, and, in regard to the peculiar nature of the Logos Himself, marks no change at all. Both before, after, and especially as the Agent carrying out the Creation, the Logos is engaged in activities.

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 61:284B.

<sup>2</sup> *I Apol.*, 23:68c.

But subsequent to Creation, the objective of certain of these activities is concerned entirely with affairs of our world, and with angels and men in particular. Henceforth, the Logos is to be designated "Lord," "God," "Saviour," "Priest," "First Principle," "Potency," and by many other titles<sup>1</sup> which are intended to indicate his official functions as the Father's Intermediary in relation with the world. Further discussion of this aspect of the Logos will be found in the following sections.

#### 5.—*The Logos, the Divine Agent in Creation*

While the Father is represented as the actual Creator,<sup>2</sup> the Creation is not ascribed to His direct intervention, on account of the prevailing philosophical view of the transcendence of the Supreme, but to the Logos who was His Agent. An important passage states that—"His Son . . . the Logos, Who was also with Him when He (God) created and arranged all things through Him as a beginning, is called Christ."<sup>3</sup> As the Agent in the Creation the Son carries out the divine will fully and absolutely. But unlike the other Apologists, Justin holds the Platonic<sup>4</sup> view of the Creation. That is to say, that God, by the Agency of His Intermediary, fabricates eternally existing matter

<sup>1</sup> See p. 138, *seq.*

<sup>2</sup> E.g., I *Apol.*, 28, 59, etc.

<sup>3</sup> II *Apol.*, 6:44D.

<sup>4</sup> Plato, *Timaeus*, 30c; cf. Justin, I *Apol.*, 10 and 59. Philo accepts same theory.

into Cosmos. It was in order to effect this change that "God begat,"<sup>1</sup> as Justin informs us, "a First Principle, a certain Rational Potency." This divine Production he identifies with the "Beginning" in Proverbs, viz.: "the Lord made me the 'Beginning' of His works . . . before He made the earth . . . When He made the heavens . . . and the foundations of the earth, I was with Him arranging."<sup>2</sup> The Apologist also considers that when God said "Let us make man,"<sup>3</sup> He addressed the Son or Logos, and thus invited Him to co-operate in the creative work. Thenceforth, the Logos is the unique divine Intermediary of the Father in the Creation, and in Cosmic affairs generally.

#### 6.—*Christ, the Spermatic Logos*

Justin takes most extensive views of the significance of Christ in human history. Not only is He the moral and spiritual power making for righteousness among men since His Advent as Man, but also, as the Apologist conceives, He was that Divine Potency operating among all nations from the Creation, ever present and continuously active. For this reason Justin designates Christ the "Seminal" or "Spermatic" Logos.

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 61:284A. Of course, the Creation was not the only object for which God generated the Logos.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 61:284E; cf. *Dial.*, 62:285E. "He, whom Solomon calls Wisdom was begotten by God before all creatures, a Beginning." (First Principle.)

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 62:285D.

Upon the analogy of the Stoic theory, he imagines Christ as pervading the moral and spiritual universe, indeed, so completely, that no worship is true, no good life can be lived, unless in accordance with the Logos-Christ.

#### THE GOOD LIFE LIVED ACCORDING TO LOGOS

A Stoic maxim intimated that the good life could be lived only "according to Nature" or Logos; the evil life was irrational,<sup>1</sup> that is contrary to Logos. But for Christians, good living was living according to Christ<sup>2</sup>—and that not figuratively but actually, since the good life depended upon the use of reason, for "whatever the Logos orders us not to choose, the thinking (intelligent or full of Logos) man will not choose."<sup>3</sup> Therefore wisdom, i.e., inspiration by Logos, is necessary for a righteous life. The whole Christian life and service of Christ is rational—"we rationally worship Him"<sup>4</sup>—even though unbelievers speak of our "madness." Those who enjoy salvation, Justin says, are those "in whom dwells the seed<sup>5</sup> of God, the Logos." This seed signifies man's "rational apprehension of truth," and is that proportion of Logos which the soul is capable of containing. Through

<sup>1</sup> ἄλογον or ἄνευ λόγου.—I *Apol.*, 46:83c.

<sup>2</sup> κατὰ λόγον.

<sup>3</sup> I *Apol.*, 12:60a; cf. 46:83e.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 13:60e.

<sup>5</sup> σπέρμα.—*Ibid.*, 32:74b. Otto's reading σπέρμα for πνεῦμα.

possession of this seed, the soul lives within the divine life of the Logos.

#### LOGOS OPPOSED BY DAEMONS

Justin's view of the spiritual realm tends somewhat to dualism.<sup>1</sup> For while the Logos is ever the active agent of God, against Him is the continuous evil influence of the daemons. However, the Logos will triumph over them and all evil eventually. Both these forces were at work in the past, for "among Greeks<sup>2</sup> these (evils) were condemned through Logos, by the agency of Socrates," but also among "Barbarians by the Logos Himself Who took shape and became Man."

#### LOGOS THE SOURCE OF ALL TRUTH TO MEN

It was the belief among early Christians that the noblest teaching of pagans was drawn from the Old Testament.<sup>3</sup> And on the assumption that Christ as the Prophetic Logos inspired the Prophets, and as the Spermatic Logos He illumined the Greek seers, the Apologist states:—"Thence, there seem to be seeds of truth among all men,"<sup>4</sup> for all truth issued from the

<sup>1</sup> See p. 173.

<sup>2</sup> I *Apol.*, 5:56A. The term "Barbarian," signifies people not Greeks, e.g., Jews who became Christians.

<sup>3</sup> Philo traces Plato's doctrine of Ideas to Moses (*de Mundi Opif.*, 4) an opinion found in the Apologists and the Alexandrines, Clement and Origen.

<sup>4</sup> I *Apol.*, 44:82A.

Logos originally. And upon the same ground he ventures the opinion that Stoic ethics were "admirable through the seed<sup>1</sup> of the Logos implanted in every race." The Apologist records also that all those who lived the rational<sup>2</sup> life, such as Heraclitus, Musonius, and others, the daemons caused to be hated, and it is only to be expected that Christians who live, not only according "to a part<sup>3</sup> of the Spermatic Logos," but according to "the whole Logos, which is Christ," will be much worse hated. From these statements of Justin, it is clear that<sup>4</sup> human reason, when it is inspired by the Divine Reason, is capable of grasping noble truth even apart from specific revelation, such as was conveyed by prophets or by Jesus Christ.

### JUSTIN'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

The conception of Christ as the Spermatic Logos is Justin's great thought. Though this speculation is worked out in the light of his knowledge of the philosophical Logos, Justin's chief interest in the notion is in its practical application to moral and

<sup>1</sup> *II Apol.*, 8:46c.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 8:46c.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 8:46c-d. The whole Logos, i.e., Christ, is contrasted with the Spermatic Logos, i.e., the limited rational activity of God's Truth in man's soul. But since Christ's Advent, the whole Logos has been granted to man. In the Logos all Christians share according to capacity.

<sup>4</sup> Justin means that these logoi (seeds) of the Spermatic Logos are not merely identical with natural rationality, but are something given in addition thereto. Ordinary human reason allowed man's mind to err, sometimes very grossly; the logoi guaranteed certain truths, and must thus have been supra-natural spiritual endowments.

spiritual life. By this conception of the Logos he means that age-long continuity of Christ's moral and spiritual work among mankind which was bounded only by the limits of the universe. And the manner in which he applies the idea to Christian teaching exhibits striking originality. It is his philosophy of history, by means of which credit can be given to paganism for all the moral goodness it contains—an excellence which may be viewed as a kind of unconscious and unintentional *Preparatio Evangelica*. While he attributes to the Church the teaching that "Christ<sup>1</sup> is the First-born of God," he himself accepts responsibility for the statement that "Christ is the Logos of Whom every race of men partook; and those who lived rationally are Christians, even if they were regarded as atheists." But on the other hand, those who lived "'irrationally'<sup>2</sup> were evil and enemies to Christ," even before Christ had made His Advent. And in very explicit language he claims that all the moral and intellectual good in the world is Christian, viz.: "Among all men,<sup>3</sup> whatsoever was spoken nobly belongs to us Christians," and Christ was "partially<sup>4</sup> known even to Socrates."

#### LOGOS, THE INSPIRER OF THE AGES

In Justin's view, all this moral and intellectual excellence is a Christianity in the nascent stage—

<sup>1</sup> I *Apol.*, 46:83c.

<sup>3</sup> II *Apol.*, 13:51c.

<sup>2</sup> "Living without Logos."

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 10:48e.



a Christianity before Christ. Taking a comprehensive survey of man's history, the Apologist seems to insinuate that, throughout the welter of human affairs, Christ's moral teaching, in a special sense, was ever an active factor, His "rational Word" shining as a bright light amid the darkness of human error, unceasingly striving to enlighten, despite the opposition of daemons, the men whom the daemons had deceived. Even the inspiring vision of the Hebrew seers, or the brightest torches of philosophy which burned in the sublime discourses of Socrates or in the penetrating dialectic of Plato, were, in comparison, but ~~dim~~, flickering, uncertain guides, though reliable in so far as they possessed a share in the divine Logos.

"For always whatsoever philosophers and lawgivers spoke nobly and contemplated, they elaborated by discovering and cogitating according to (their) share of the Logos. But since they did not know the whole Logos, which is Christ, they often spoke contrary to themselves."<sup>1</sup> "For all writers, through the sowing<sup>2</sup> in them of the implanted Logos, were able to see realities,<sup>3</sup> but only dimly." This inspiration of the individual as by a rational seed, is only partial and at best but a participation in, and imitation of, the Reality,<sup>4</sup> which is far superior. Through Christ's providential government of the world, intellectually

<sup>1</sup> II *Apol.*, 10:48c.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 13:51D; cf. "For each spoke nobly through a share in the divine spermatik Logos"—*ibid.*, 51C.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 13:51 D-E.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 13:51D-E.

and spiritually, men have thus been saved from falling into entire absurdity. And "these things our Christ did through His own power."<sup>1</sup>

#### ADVANTAGE OF PERSONAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST

Justin then proceeds to set forth vividly the vast advantage the race has gained through the Advent of Christ to the world. If so much good could be disseminated by the activity of the Logos when using only the feeble agency of men, to whom He could impart but a mere σπέρμα, μέρος or σπόρα of His Logos-Potency, how great a blessing should be received through the grace of the whole Logos now present in fullness! Indeed, the concrete reality of the presence of the total Logos-Potency among men is borne out by the fact that "not only philosophers and the learned believed, but also workmen and the altogether uneducated, . . . because He is the Potency of the Ineffable Father"<sup>2</sup>—that powerful Teacher who was able to impart to men not merely theoretical ideas, but such correct knowledge as could bear fruit in good ethics. Thus we see, by the presence in them of the divine gift, men were made both λογικοί and πνευματικοί.

#### LOGOS, THE "RIGHT REASON"

Justin also thinks of Christ as the Right Reason, stating that "the Right Reason,<sup>3</sup> when he came,

<sup>1</sup> II *Apol.*, 10:48E.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 10:49A; cf. *Athenag.*, II:11 C-D.

<sup>3</sup> ὁρθὸς λόγος.

proved that not all opinions nor all doctrines are good, for some are evil, while others are good."<sup>1</sup> He represents Christ as supplying the proper measure and standard of truth, being Himself its veritable and final test. No doubt, the reference is to the Advent of the Incarnate Logos, when, as we are often told, he destroyed the power of the daemons, which had deceived men for so long. Daemons had corrupted more or less even philosophers, so the Apologist believed. But still, though he himself had relinquished the schools for Christianity, he could accept at least some elements of their teaching. Despite, however, the existence of the good and true in philosophy, Christ, for Justin, is the absolute test of all human opinions moral or intellectual, and Christianity is the only true philosophy.<sup>2</sup>

#### 7.—*The Many-Named Logos*

An interesting feature of Justin's Christology is the number and variety of names, titles, and designations which he attaches to the Logos. Of these, the following list will be found to be representative: Helper, Rising, Servant, Man, Suffering One, Rod, Flower, Stone, Corner Stone, Star, Captain, Just One, Joseph, Judah, Jacob, Israel, Day, Sword, Lawgiver, Angel, Angel of Great Counsel, High Priest, Offspring, Child, Only-begotten, First-born of God, Son of God, Wisdom, Potency, Rational Potency, First Principle,

<sup>1</sup> II *Apol.*, 9:48B.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 8.

Immanuel, Glory of the Lord, Everlasting King, King of Glory, Lord, Lord of Hosts, Christ and God.

Though in the other Apologists several names and titles are given to Logos, some of which are found in all these writers, the greatest variety by far occurs in Justin. Part of this material has been used in Scripture as descriptive of God or the Son, but it is probable that other names, some of which bear philosophical associations, were drawn directly from the Judaeo-Alexandrian religious literature.

However, this feature is not peculiar to Christian writings of the period. For the Stoics were in the habit of attaching many names to the Logos of their own conception.<sup>1</sup> Likewise, Philo<sup>2</sup> and other Alexandrian writers employ a nomenclature for Logos of great variety, many of the titles being identical with those found in the Apologists.

It is probable that in the minds of the Apologists a philosophical principle was perceived to underlie this practice. For Athenagoras<sup>3</sup> comments: "Stoics, by the names they use to suit the changes of matter, which they say is permeated by the Spirit of God, make the Deity many-named, though actually considering God to be Unity." And Justin, in the course of an argument, remarks, "For Logos can be called by

<sup>1</sup> E.g., Seneca, *Nat. Quest.*, II, 45; Stob. *Eclog.*, I, 30.

<sup>2</sup> E.g., *Migr. Abr.*, ii, 23; *Confus. Ling.*, 14; *Leg. All.*, III, 31, etc., I *Somn.*, 37, 11, 12.

<sup>3</sup> *Supplic.*, 6.

all these names, because He serves the Father's will." The materialistic, pantheistic Stoic Logos had been idealized by the Platonists of the period, and transferred into a new environment with consequent changes in conception. Thus do we find Justin referring to the application of many titles to the work performed by Logos, as Son fulfilling the Father's will in the universe.

Again, while Alexandrian thought regarded God as the Eternal Being, Unnamed, Unknowable,<sup>1</sup> the Logos was both known and named. In accordance therewith Justin states "To the Father of all, . . . no name is given, but His Son is named Christ."<sup>2</sup> The transcendent Father, having revealed Himself by Logos, His all-sufficient Intermediary, it was not inappropriate to name the Logos in respect to the various duties he performed, or the spheres He occupied, in fulfilling the Father's will.

#### 4.—*Dispensational Christology*

##### (a) *Christ in the Old Testament Prophecies*

Forming one part of the age-long and universal operations of the Logos, Justin draws attention to those activities of Christ which were displayed in Jewish history in so much detail.

<sup>1</sup> Philo, I *Somn.*, 11; Logos is "Many-named archangel," *Conf. Ling.*, 28.

<sup>2</sup> II *Apol.*, 6:44D.

FULFILLED PROPHECY THE PROOF THAT CHRIST IS  
SON OF GOD

The activity of the Logos in history receives frequent notice in Philo. For example, referring to the rise and fall of many great nations, Philo explains that "the Divine Logos, which most men call Fortune, moves in a circle. In constant stream it acts upon cities and nations, distributing the possessions of one to the other."<sup>1</sup> Following perhaps this fancy of Philo, Justin sees Christ, the Logos, referred to in many prophecies, and taking a leading part in the Old Testament dispensation in general. All prophecy is due to His inspiration, and all providential government springs from Him directly. Justin's object in so describing Christ was to establish the fact that a certain class of prophecy (a large portion of which was fulfilled), was the basis of the Christian claim that Christ was the Son of God, the Logos, "For with what reason," he asks, "should we accredit to a crucified man that he is the First-Born of the Ingenerate God, . . . unless we had found testimonies concerning Him announced before He came and was born Man, and unless we saw they happened accordingly?"<sup>2</sup> In the time of the Apologists great significance was accorded to revelational<sup>3</sup> truth, as a recoil from the prevailing scepticism felt toward all the ratiocination of the philosophical schools. But the question arose,

<sup>1</sup> *Quod Deus Immut.*, 36.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 53.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 87.

since the prophecies were in possession of the Jews for centuries, Why was not their Christological purport perceived before the Advent of Christ? To this query Justin is ready with the reply that " Unless by God's grace a man receives the ability to understand what has been said and done by the prophets, the appearance of being able to narrate the words or the deeds will not profit him, if he cannot present their argument."<sup>1</sup> In several places in the *Dialogue* he reminds his Jewish auditors that he possesses the gift of understanding the true, inner import of prophecy. The gift Justin claims is really a " gnosis "<sup>2</sup> similar to that in Alexandrian theosophy, which, if applied to Scripture by allegory, produced remarkable results. And he chides both Trypho and Jews in general for being unable to interpret the prophetic scriptures. Furthermore, he promises to prove that Christians, in regard to the claims they make for Christ, the Logos, do not put their trust in empty tales, but rely upon " words<sup>3</sup> filled with the Spirit of God."

The Apologist is eager to discover Christ in the elements of prophecy, believing, as he takes pains to point out, that the highest subject of prophecy was

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 92:319C, cf. 114. Apparently the Jews in Justin's opinion did not possess this gnosis.

<sup>2</sup> Clement of Rome (Epist. I) refers to the same gnosis of the O.T. Also Barnabas in his Epistle, calls it gnosis in contrast to pistis; cf. St. Paul, Cor., xii, 1., also Epist. Hebrews, v, 12.

<sup>3</sup> *Dial.*, 8 and 9.

Christ Himself—the Messiah Who was to come. As the “Promised One” of prophecy, Christ Incarnate was not new, as if only suddenly born, and therefrom beginning His redemptive work, for this Divine Personage was the Father’s Minister in effecting the Creation, and ever since was His constant Representative and Principal Agent in history—a fact brought out with marked lucidity in Justin’s interpretation of Jewish history.

#### SCRIPTURE PASSAGES SPOKEN BY LOGOS

Though much of his rendering of prophecy is dependent upon allegorical speculation, yet, citing the Old Testament in all cases as his authority, he is able to advance apparently sound views, despite that sometimes they may be at variance with ancient Hebrew teaching. He claims to be able to detect amongst prophetic utterances a certain type of oracle which was “spoken by the Spirit in the person of the Son,”<sup>1</sup> such as “I have spread out my hands to a disobedient and gainsaying people.” Of this class of prophecy he cites many examples. The Incarnate Christ, in the Apologist’s opinion, was actually one of the Prophets, and he believes that everything which Christ foretold is actually “seen taking place”<sup>2</sup>—to the Apologist a wonderful verification both of the

<sup>1</sup> *I Apol.*, 38.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 12:60A.—“our Teacher foretold that all these things should happen . . . this is the work of God to tell of a thing before it happens.” Cf. *Dial.*, 35:253B, 82:308C.



Old Testament and the authority<sup>1</sup> of Christ. After the Advent, prophecy among the Jews having ceased, it rested on Christ and from Him Christians<sup>2</sup> receive prophetic gifts. Thus Justin implies that the whole of the dispensational government of the Jews was vested in Christ, the mouthpiece of the prophetic Spirit and Himself a prophet.

An aspect of prophecy of great importance for Justin's Christology is his interpretation of a multitude of prophetic utterances as predictions designed by the Spirit to apply to Christ. But as it would not materially assist us in our inquiry to follow our Apologist through this maze of allegory, we shall cull from it whatever results for Christology he thereby gains.

#### MATTERS TOUCHING CHRIST'S EARTHLY LIFE FORETOLD

Many of the personal qualities and attributes of Christ, besides numerous circumstances and events in his earthly life, Justin claims, were foreshadowed in the Old Testament. Therefrom he deduces scriptural authority for Christ's Pre-Existence, His Divinity, His first and second Advents,<sup>3</sup> and for His "being and being called, the Son of God"—all of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Dial.*, 35:254A.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 87:315A; 82:308B.

<sup>3</sup> "In these books of the prophets, we found Jesus our Christ foretold as coming, born of a Virgin, growing to manhood," endowed with miraculous powers. Also, in the same, Justin saw predicted Christ's Resurrection, Ascension, and all his suffering.—*Ibid.*, 14:232D, 26:243D; cf. 84:310C.

which he claims are fulfilled. Christ is that Messiah foreannounced in the Old Testament in the passage (to cite one example among many)—“ Say ye to the daughter of Zion, Thy Saviour has come,”<sup>1</sup> which refers to the first Advent. In Daniel vii, His second Advent is foretold, viz.: “ He<sup>2</sup> shall come on the clouds as the Son of Man.” While these examples exhibit the arbitrariness of Justin’s allegorical interpretations of Scripture, yet, from his standpoint and within the limits of his investigation, the results obtained, admittedly, attain a high degree of persuasiveness.

(b) *Christ, the New Covenant*

Christ is that sublime Personage who carries out the Father’s will in human affairs. Envisaged philosophically, as we have seen, Justin can identify Him as the Spermatic Logos; but viewed from the standpoint of the Biblical interpretation of History, the Apologist sees in Him the Divine Dispensator of the World.

CHRIST THE DISPENSATOR OF HISTORY

Replying to objections urged by Trypho against certain of his scriptural interpretations, the Apologist

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 26:243D; cf. 84:3roc. “ ‘ Behold, a virgin shall conceive’ signifies that the First-Born of all Creation should become incarnate by the virgin’s womb. This was anticipated by the spirit of prophecy, that when it was fulfilled, it might be known as the work of the power of the Maker of all things.”

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 31.

states that Christ "endured all these things, not as being justified by them, but as fulfilling<sup>1</sup> the Dispensation which His Father willed." This term "Dispensation"<sup>2</sup> in Justin "designates in whole or in part the realization of the plan of God amongst men, principally in the Incarnation and Redemption."<sup>3</sup> Justin characterizes the Mosaic Law with all its symbolic details as incomplete, a shadow of things to come, the consummation of which is found in Christ Who is the New Covenant which supersedes the old.<sup>4</sup> "For," as he believes, "if God proclaimed a New Covenant . . . as a light unto the Gentiles, and we see and are persuaded that through the Name of Jesus . . . men have come to God from idols and other iniquity, . . . then it is possible for all to understand that He is the New Law and the New Covenant."<sup>5</sup> This divinely-instituted New Covenant provided both for the redeeming and for the governing of the world according to God's will, as foreshadowed in prophecy.

#### I.—FIRST, THERE IS A REDEMPTIONAL DISPENSATION

Justin maintains that "our Jesus, Who has not yet come in glory, has sent into Jerusalem a rod of Power, namely, the word of calling and repentance for all nations."<sup>6</sup> But this call to repentance was

<sup>1</sup> οἰκονομίαν ἀπαρτίζοντα.—*Dial.*, 67:29IE.

<sup>2</sup> οἰκονομία.

<sup>3</sup> Archambault:—*Dial. cum Tryphone*, 134.

<sup>4</sup> Ep. Heb., viii. Evidently an Alexandrian opinion.

<sup>5</sup> *Dial.*, 11:228 D-E.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 83:209E.

foreannounced ages ago. A forecast of the Redemptional Dispensation is visible also in Joshua who is a "type of Christ"—"our Priest, God and the Son of God."<sup>1</sup> Again, in Noah and the flood, the Apologist sees a prophetic revelation of God's redemptive purpose in Christ's work. He believes that the words "I have saved<sup>2</sup> thee in the deluge of Noah" mean that the "mystery of saved men existed even in the deluge of Noah. . . . For Christ, the First-born of every creature, became again the beginning of another race regenerated by Himself."<sup>3</sup> Further, Justin recognizes in the blessing of Shem and Japheth by Noah, an expression of God's will which He would fulfil in Christ, "Who has come . . . calling men to friendship, blessing, repentance,"<sup>4</sup> and everlasting life in Him. In general, Christ's Redemptional Work was foretold in the passage—"He shall be the desire of all nations, binding His foal to the vine, and washing His robe in the blood of the grape"<sup>5</sup>; for the "blood of the grape" is "predicative of His passion," and the "robe" represents believers whom He cleanses.

#### THE MOSAIC LAW SYMBOLIC

The Apologist selects certain statements in the Mosaic Law as being of Dispensational significance.

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 115:343B.

<sup>2</sup> These words not in LXX.

<sup>3</sup> *Dial.*, 138:367C-D: cf. Coloss., Epist. i, 18: "the Beginning" (*ἀρχή*). Christ is the Arche or Causal First Principle of the new generation.

<sup>4</sup> *Dial.*, 139:368E, 369A.

<sup>5</sup> *I Apol.*, 32:73B; cf. *Dial.*, 54.

For example, the Lamb which was to be sacrificed is a "type<sup>1</sup> of Christ . . . a symbol of the suffering of the Cross"; the "offering of fine flour" is a "figure<sup>2</sup> of the bread of the Eucharist"; and the bells<sup>3</sup> on the High Priest's robe symbolize the Apostles of Christ.

#### MYSTERIOUS O.T. PASSAGES REFERRING TO CHRIST

Again, certain Old Testament mysteries forecast Christ's saving work. Even the polygamous marriages of the Patriarchs, he considers, have a Dispensational application.<sup>4</sup> There was a divine motive concealed therein, and such acts were "types of what Christ was to carry out." The old exclusive privilege of Israel was therefore abolished, for "Christ is come to restore the free children,<sup>5</sup> and the bond slaves, giving the same honour to all who keep His commandments."<sup>6</sup> The comprehensiveness of Christ's Redemptional Dispensation is shown by the fact that while "Jacob served Laban for speckled and many-spotted sheep," "Christ served<sup>7</sup> even to the slavery of the Cross for the various and many-formed races

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 40:259B-C.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 41:259E.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 42:260D. He boasts that "by enumerating all the other appointments of Moses, I can show that they were types, symbols, and declarations of all those things which were to happen to Christ."  
—*Ibid.*, 41:261B.

<sup>4</sup> "For certain dispensations of weighty mysteries were accomplished in each act of this kind"; "the marriages of Jacob were types of what Christ was to carry out."—*Ibid.*, 134:364A.

<sup>5</sup> I.e., in type, those of Jacob.

<sup>6</sup> *Dial.*, 134:364C.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 134:364D.

of mankind, acquiring them by the blood and mystery of the Cross."

2.—SECONDLY, THERE IS A GUBERNATORIAL  
DISPENSATION.

Justin shows Trypho from Psalm 110 that God's dispensational government had required Christ to sit at the Father's right hand until His enemies are made His footstool. And he proceeds to state that the time for Christ's reign is approaching according to Daniel's prophecy. From the same Psalm also he shows that it is Christ Who is to be the "Everlasting Priest" of the New Covenant,<sup>1</sup> ministering to the uncircumcision. Again, the statement that the "Law of the Lord is perfect" refers not to the Mosaic code, as the Jews believed, but to the "Law which is subsequent to Moses"<sup>2</sup>—the "New Law and the New Covenant"—Christ.

From other passages, he establishes the belief that God made Christ to be "King, Lord, Priest, God, . . . first subject to suffering, then returning to heaven, and again coming with glory. And He is preached as possessing the everlasting Kingdom."<sup>3</sup> And further, as "Lord of Hosts," Christ shall have authority both in earth and in heaven, sitting at the right hand of the Father.

<sup>1</sup> But Jews believed that the statement referred to Hezekiah; cf. Hebrews Epist. vii.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 34:251C.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 34:251D-E.

5.—*Christ's Incarnation and His Earthly Life*

The difference in the conception of the metaphysical Logos from the Incarnate Son is fully appreciated by Justin. This he represents aptly in the passage: "The Logos Himself, having taken shape<sup>1</sup> and become Man, and been called Christ"; and again with even more contrast: "The First Potency after God . . . is the Logos, the Son, . . . and we will relate how He took flesh<sup>2</sup> and became Man." By these and further statements, the Apologist proclaims his unhesitating belief in the remarkable theory that the Divine Reason, the totality of Rational Potency which issued from the Supreme, having become the Personal Logos-Son, now in these last days had submitted to the shape and limitation of a Man, having become Incarnate.

## TWO ASPECTS OF CHRIST

Without ever explicitly instancing the Christological enigma of the personal double-nature, Justin shows that he is cognisant of a two-fold significance attaching to the single Personality of Christ, e.g., "it is declared that He would come forth from the highest heavens and again return to the same places, in order that you may recognize Him as God coming forth from above, and Man living among men."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *I Apol.*, 5:56A.—μορφωθέντος.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 32:74B—σαρκοποιηθεὶς.

<sup>3</sup> *Dial.*, 64:288E.

And further, he refers to Christ as being simply the Logos formerly, but now as become also Man by God's will.<sup>1</sup>

### THE INCARNATION PROPHESIED

His statements in reference to the Incarnation are based upon Old Testament prophecies, and the historical facts contained in the "Memoirs of the Apostles."<sup>2</sup> That the Incarnation was due to the will of God, and was determined upon even before the Creation, he deduces by allegory from the assertion in Psalm 110, viz.: "In the splendours of Thy holiness have I begotten Thee from the womb, before the morning star."<sup>3</sup>

### THE VIRGIN BIRTH

He never tires of insisting upon the Virgin Birth<sup>4</sup> as the means of Christ's Incarnation. But he would urge that, despite resemblances to pagan legends, Christ's Incarnation differs from that of the reputed "Sons of Zeus" in that it did not involve "sexual intercourse."<sup>5</sup> Though the possibility of divine appearances in human form was allowed by Jews and Greeks, that the Logos or Son of God should be "born

<sup>1</sup> I *Apol.*, 63:96A.

<sup>2</sup> I.e., the Synoptists, chiefly St. Matthew.

<sup>3</sup> *Dial.*, 63:286E. The LXX version differs from the Hebrew.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Dial.*, 23:241B, 43:262B, 63:286E, 66:290E, 75:301A, 85:311B, 100:326E, 105:332D, also I *Apol.*, 33:74E, 35:75E, etc.

<sup>5</sup> *ἀνευ ἐπιμιξίας*.—I *Apol.*, 21:66E.



a Man" was denied by both.<sup>1</sup> Still, since Trypho had accepted the scriptural proofs as adduced by Justin of Christ's many appearances to the patriarchs, some of which were "in human form," the Apologist argues that it should not be hard to believe that "it was possible for Him to be born Man of the Virgin according to the will of the Father<sup>2</sup> of the universe."

If the Virgin Birth was not a fact, then scripture is self-contradictory, "For if He were to be born of sexual intercourse, like all other first-born sons, why did God say He would give a sign?" viz.: "Behold a Virgin shall conceive." "That the First-born of all Creation should be incarnated by the Virgin's womb, . . . God anticipated by the Spirit of Prophecy," so that the miraculous nature of the birth, "by the power<sup>3</sup> and will" of God should be recognized. While the doctrine of "original sin" would make ordinary generation impossible as a means for the entry of the Son of God into the human race, there is no evidence that Justin knew of that doctrine, unless, possibly, reference is made thereto in the statement that Christ was "born without sin."<sup>4</sup> His main ground for insisting on the Virgin Birth is scriptural. This was also convenient, for it enabled him to connect forthwith the "Logos-Christ" with the Old Testament

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 97, note 2; cf. *Dial.*, 48.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 75:301A.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 84:310B; cf. 63:286E, I *Apol.*, 32:74C; see p. 145, note 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Dial.*, 23:241B; cf. *Epist. Romans*, v, 12.

dispensation<sup>1</sup>; and to represent Him as miraculously born—a miraculous birth being the only fitting manner for the “Son” of God to enter the human race. Born miraculously like a god, Justin could claim also that He was born “without sin,” which was particularly godlike.<sup>2</sup>

#### JUSTIN BASES DOCTRINE OF INCARNATION UPON O.T.

The difficulties attaching to the hypothesis of the Incarnation of the Divine Reason or Logos are confessedly considerable. However, when the Apologist is confronted by the supersensible nature of the Logos on the one hand, and the passible nature of the Incarnate Son on the other, he does not attempt to overcome the apparent discrepancy by philosophical argument, but confidently makes his appeal to Scripture. Indeed, he would have deemed argument upon such a subject unnecessary, since, on his own interpretation of certain Old Testament passages it would have been placed beyond the reach of argument, being, in his estimation, firmly based upon Scripture as the final ground of appeal. Therefore, establishing himself upon the vantage ground of the Old Testament, he delivers his dogmatic assertions fearlessly, whatever the philosophical difficulties, insisting that the First-begotten of all created beings

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 66:290E. Since “in the seed of Abraham after the flesh, no one has been born of a Virgin, but our Christ”; cf. 43:262C.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 23:241B; cf. 102, 17, 110, etc.

should become incarnate by the Virgin's womb, and become truly a Child.<sup>1</sup>

#### DIFFICULTIES EXPLAINED

However, the difficulties Justin encounters in maintaining the position as indicated above are lightened somewhat by his explanations of the passages: "Who shall declare His generation,"<sup>2</sup> and "washing His robe in the blood of the grape."<sup>3</sup> Christ's generation is from above. It is of the Father—Divine, and essentially different from man's generation; no man can declare it. For Christ's Incarnation was wrought by the "power and will of the Maker of the universe"<sup>4</sup>; "the power<sup>5</sup> of God coming upon the Virgin, overshadowed her, and caused her, though a Virgin, to conceive." And the phrase "blood of the grape," which by allegory refers to the blood of Christ, "signifies that He Who should appear would have blood, though not of the seed of man, but of the power of God." Since man<sup>6</sup> did not make the grape, but God, so the quality of Christ's

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 84:310B.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 63:286D; cf. *Dial.*, 43, 68, 76.

<sup>3</sup> Genesis, 49:10—cited in I *Apol.*, 32:74B and *Dial.*, 52:271E, 53:272D, 54:274A.

<sup>4</sup> *Dial.*, 84:310B; cf. *Dial.*, 23:241B, 48:267D, 63:286E; I *Apol.*, 23:68C, 46:83D; II *Apol.*, 6:45A.

<sup>5</sup> I *Apol.*, 33:75A. Since Christ is God's Potency, the "power" (*δύναμις*) in this passage may mean Christ as the Logos, though the identity is not beyond doubt. Indisputably the dynamis was divine. In another passage, it means the Logos—see note 1, p. 155.

<sup>6</sup> *Dial.*, 54:274A.

blood was directly due to His being the Logos. That is to say, that the animate principle in Christ's body sprang, not from the Virgin, but from the Logos-Potency, by which it was transmitted<sup>1</sup> through Mary. And thus, to Justin's mind, there was established the existence of a direct connexion or identity between the Spiritual Logos and the Incarnate Christ.

### CERTAIN HERETICAL VIEWS

Without entering upon a discussion of false views of the Incarnation, he refers in passing to certain Christians "who admit that He is Christ, while holding Him to be a man<sup>2</sup> of men." With such heterodox Christians, perhaps Ebionites, he cannot agree, and on scriptural evidence proves their views false. And again, he also makes reference to a class of teachers who would account for Christ's earthly life "by His having been anointed by election and thereupon to have become Christ."<sup>3</sup> But Justin insists firmly upon the miraculous circumstances attending the Birth of Christ, declaring with iteration that he was "born Man of a Virgin," and was incarnated in reality, so that His flesh was absolutely His own individually.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This "Power of God" is the "Logos, the First-born of God, which, when it came upon her, caused her to conceive, not by intercourse, but by power."—I *Apol.*, 33:75C; cf. 66:98A.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 48:267E.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 48:267E, 49:268A, i.e., Adoptionism.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 84:310B; cf. I *Apol.*, 32:74C, 66:98A.

## THE INCARNATION REAL

The Apologist even puts himself to some pains to demonstrate that the Incarnation itself was a reality. From Psalm 22 he deduces that Christ "became Man actually, being capable of suffering."<sup>1</sup> And from the "Memoirs" he gathers that "He was made of like passions"<sup>2</sup> with men, was a "sharer of our sufferings,"<sup>3</sup> and had an "inglorious, obscure, mortal appearance."<sup>4</sup> This evidence thus renders absurd the Docetic opinion which maintains that "being the Son of God, He did not apprehend what was happening to Him"<sup>5</sup> in the Crucifixion.

## ELEMENTS OF CHRIST'S HUMAN NATURE

In a difficult passage the Apologist attributes to Christ *σῶμα, λόγον, ψυχήν*.<sup>6</sup> It is useless to perceive in Justin's words an anticipation of later theories of the double nature of Christ. His meaning is much less speculative. What he wishes to convey is probably that "the whole Rational Principle"<sup>7</sup> became the Man Christ in a full sense. While Dorner considers that Justin would teach nothing contrary to Christ's full human nature, Semisch and Neander doubt that he allowed to Christ a human rational soul. But, since Justin cites elsewhere the passage from St.

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 98:325A.<sup>2</sup> *II Apol.*, 10:49A.<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 13:51D.<sup>4</sup> *Dial.*, 14:232D.<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 103:331E.<sup>6</sup> *II Apol.*, 10:48B, see Bethune-Baker, *Hist. Christ. Doct.*, p. 125.<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 10:48B.

Luke: "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit,"<sup>1</sup> and accepts its application to Christ's Incarnate nature, any doubt upon this point is settled herewith conclusively. But what of the λόγος in the above passage? If the ψυχή be the animate principle, and the σῶμα the human body, then the λόγος would stand for the human mind or rational soul—three terms which give a conventional view of the chief elements in human nature.

#### KENOSIS

Justin shows *in extenso* the effect upon His Incarnate life of the "self-emptying"<sup>2</sup> by the Divine Logos. Even at His birth Christ "was in possession of His power; and, as He grew up like all other men, He assigned what was appropriate to each development."<sup>3</sup> He was baptized not because of inherent insufficiency of Spirit, but merely on account of His connection with humanity; He allowed Himself to be considered the Son of a carpenter, and appeared without comeliness, submitting even to dishonour and scourging. But Justin urges upon Trypho that this Christ, despite these humbling conditions, is that One announced by the prophets, Whom such dishonouring events merely mark out indisputably as the "Coming One" of prophecy.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> St. Luke xxiii, 6—cited in *Dial.*, 105:333A, where the term used for the soul or spirit is πνεῦμα; cf. Blunt, *op. cit.*, Introduction.

<sup>2</sup> κένωσις.

<sup>3</sup> *Dial.*, 88:315C.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 89:317B.

## THE EUCHARIST

The Apologist's teaching upon the Eucharist shows that he believes that Christ did not lay aside His humanity upon His exaltation,<sup>1</sup> but that the entire Christ of the Incarnation is present in the elements, for the "Saviour, being incarnated by the Word of God, had flesh and blood for our salvation; so likewise . . . the food blessed by prayer of His word . . . is the flesh and blood of the Incarnated Jesus."<sup>2</sup>

## EVENTS OF CHRIST'S LIFE

Justin recounts most of the incidents of Christ's earthly life which he finds recorded in the "Memoirs." These events and experiences he sometimes characterizes as fulfilments of the prophecies, and as such, indubitable proofs of the truth of the Christian doctrine and of the reality of the Logos-Christ Incarnate.

## INFLUENCE OF CHRIST'S STAINLESS PURITY

Jesus Christ upon earth is also represented by Justin as the greatest and most conspicuous Moral Personality in history. He is said to have "been born by the will of God without sin,"<sup>3</sup> to be the "only blameless, righteous Man,"<sup>4</sup> and "the most righteous, only spotless and faultless Christ."<sup>5</sup> But in addition

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Dorner, *op. cit.*—Justin, vol. I, div. I.

<sup>2</sup> I *Apol.*, 66:98A-B.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 17:234D.

<sup>3</sup> *Dial.*, 23:241B.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 110:337E.

to the evidence derived from Christ's words and acts, and certain prophetic statements, the superlative purity of His character is inferred from the remarkable effects of His influence upon mankind. The Apologist confesses that "By persuasion<sup>1</sup> of the Logos, we (Christians) stand aloof from them (daemons), and follow the only Ingenerate God through His Son. . . . Formerly, we delighted in fornication, but now we embrace chastity, . . . and pray for our enemies." And further, he can state in witness of Christ's influence, that the "Gentiles . . . cast away their idols and have dedicated themselves to God through Christ."<sup>2</sup> Though the explicit statements are few, it is clear, nevertheless, that to Justin, Christ was the predominant Moral Character of all human history.

6.—*The Divinity and Subordination of Christ, the Logos*

Whilst the Sub-Apostolic writers affirm the Pre-existence and great dignity of Christ, the Apologists assert in unequivocal terms His actual and absolute Divinity. Despite the philosophical character of many of their statements, the Apologists represent their conception of the Divinity of Christ not as an inference from His being identified with the metaphysical Logos, but as a truth contained in the

<sup>1</sup> I *Apol.*, 14:61B.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 49; cf. *Ibid.*, 53, 61, etc.; II *Apol.*, 2, 10, etc.; *Dial.*, 121, etc.



traditional Christian doctrine, and confirmed by the Old Testament prophecies.

Early in the *Dialogue*, Justin assures Trypho that Christians accept the God of the Old Testament, and that—"There will be no other God nor was there from eternity."<sup>1</sup> Yet, apparently without being aware of any contradiction in terms, he proceeds forthwith to attach to Christ the deific appellations "God" and "Lord," which he claims to "prove from all the Scriptures"<sup>2</sup> belong to Him.

In response to Trypho's request that he should substantiate the statement that there is "another God besides the Maker of all things,"<sup>3</sup> Justin begins by asserting that "Moses<sup>4</sup> declares that He Who appeared to Abraham under the oak is God." But his Jewish auditors, evidently unable to grasp the exact meaning of the Apologist, complain later that he has not yet proved the existence of "another God" besides the One Who appeared to Abraham.<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, he proceeds to explain more precisely what meaning is intended to be conveyed by this novel use of the term "God." That Divine Being to Whom he refers is, in plain language, "Another God and

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 11:228A; cf. 56:275D, 60:284A; cf. *Athenag.*, 8, where he shows the impossibility of there being two primary Gods.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 34:251D-E; cf. 36:254D. Christ is "Lord of Hosts" (Ps. 24) and "God" (Ps. 45, 47)—*Dial.*, 37, 38.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 50:269E, ἄλλος θεός; *Dial.*, 55:274B, ἕτερος θ.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 56:275A—θεός.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 56:275C, 276C.

Lord Who is subject to the Creator of all things.”<sup>1</sup> In this statement, Christ’s relation to the Father is shown clearly to be subordinate; but, notwithstanding this, Justin has no doubt as to His full and actual divinity.

#### CHRIST’S DIVINITY DEFINED.

He then further affirms that “He is and will be God.”<sup>2</sup> But in what sense “God”? Not as a rival to the Father,<sup>3</sup> for this would be to involve ditheism which the Apologist could not countenance; not as a mere Emanation<sup>4</sup> from the Eternal One; not simply as a mode of the Father’s existence<sup>5</sup>; nor as a super-Angelic Being, only attributively divine; but Christ is the Son *κατ’ ἐξοχην*, the primal and unique generation of the Father. And Justin proceeds to show that the true basis of His Divinity rests upon the nature of His Sonship, “being God, from His being the Off-spring First-born of all created things.”<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 56:275c; cf. 276E, 277B.

<sup>2</sup> Θεός—*Dial.*, 58:281D.

<sup>3</sup> See note 1, p. 160. N.T. instances of Subordination of Son to Father: (a) in Cosmic activities; (b) in redemptive work., e.g. (a) 1 Cor., viii; Col., i, 15, etc.; (b) Gal., iv, 14; Col., i, 9; 1 Cor., xi, 3, etc.

<sup>4</sup> *Dial.*, 128

<sup>5</sup> 1 *Apol.*, 63:96c, see p. 115, note 3.

<sup>6</sup> *Dial.*, 125:354D; cf. “Logos being the First-born of God, and Himself being God”—1 *Apol.*, 63:96D; see Otto’s note *in loc.*; cf. “God, Son of God”—*Dial.*, 128:357E.

## PLURALITY OF DIVINE PERSONS

The problem, then, from one standpoint, resolved itself into the task of proving a Plurality of Persons in the Deity. That is to say, it devolved upon Justin to show that, besides the Father, there was a rightful place within the Godhead for a Second Person Who, in one sense, would be truly Divine, and yet in another sense, inferior to the Supreme and never His rival; in a word, a place for a "Θεός" Who is not another "ὁ Θεός." His use of the term "Θεός" without the article, is significant for his argument. If the suggestion of Justin's dependence on Alexandrian philosophy be accepted, then it may be assumed that Θεός as used by him, stands for a significance similar to that in Philo, viz.: deity in a secondary sense, i.e., the Logos, the Image and Shadow of God. But, as though to add difficulties, Justin sometimes employs "ὁ Θεός" also in reference to Christ.<sup>1</sup> Mystifying as this expression in the above connection may seem at first sight, this deviation from his customary usage is due merely to the occurrence of this expression in certain passages which the Apologist selects and quotes from the Septuagint as applying to Christ. But with general consistency, he reserves "ὁ Θεός" for the Father, and "Θεός" for the Son or Logos.

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 56:276C, 75:300D, 113:340C. See Donaldson, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 227. Justin used LXX, and in citing passages did not feel free to adjust the language to suit the convenience of his argument; hence the use of ὁ Θεός where Θεός was needed, see Otto, note 8, I *Apol.*, 10:58D.

## VARYING SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TERM THEOS

But in the time of Justin the term “*Θεός*” was of uncertain meaning. He himself instances Simon<sup>1</sup> who claimed to be a “god”; and examples of the use of the term in general literature are numerous, e.g., Apollonius of Tyana and the Roman Emperors<sup>2</sup> were designated “gods,” and Epictetus<sup>3</sup> states that “Diogenes and Heraclitus are justly called gods.” However, this variable usage of the term did not affect pagan Monotheism, or rather the Idealistic Pantheism of the philosophers, which was regarded as covering a multitude of deific manifestations.

## CHRIST IS GOD BECAUSE “SON OF GOD”

Justin’s application of “*Θεός*” to Christ shows plainly that he bases Christ’s Deity essentially upon His Divine Sonship. But the hypothesis of a God “in the second rank” or place is not in harmony with

<sup>1</sup> *I Apol.*, 26:69c; cf., *Athenag.*, 28.—“Aesculapius and Hermes were Gods.”

<sup>2</sup> Cf., Suetonius, *Domit.*, 13—“*Dominus et Deus meus*,” referring to Emperor Domitian; see Deissman (*Light Anc. East*, p. 357).

<sup>3</sup> *Epict.*, 5, Harnack (*Dogma*, vol. I, p. 118, E.T.), referring to use of *theos* in early Christian times: “The genius, the hero, the founder of a new school who promises to show a new way to a *vita beata*, the Emperor, the philosopher . . . the man in so far as he is inhabited by *νοῦς* can all be considered somehow *θεοί*, so variable was the term.”

Cf. Moulton and Milligan, *Lex. of N.T.*, part III. Pseudo-Justin, *Orat. ad Graec.*, states that Logos by his teaching makes mortals into gods.

See Inge, *Christ. Mysticism*, Appen. C.

Old Testament teaching, however much support the Apologist may find for it by means of allegory; indeed, it creates serious difficulties for Monotheism. For between the Ingenerate God and His Logos, "in the second place"<sup>1</sup> and derived from Him (both being considered as Persons), there must necessarily exist the difference between absolute and relative, infinite and finite, which is immeasurable. Monotheism cannot tolerate two Gods both equally Divine in all senses; and if, on the one hand, the Second God be less Divine than the First, He is not equally God in the full sense. These difficulties, admittedly, are immense. Unable to overcome them actually, the Apologist attempts to circumvent them. Making good use of his allegorical interpretations of Scripture and his philosophical knowledge, he endeavours to render conceivable the actual Divinity of the Logos or Secondary God, (a) by suggesting a moral harmony between Father and Son amounting even to identity of will<sup>2</sup>; and (b) by reasoning from the fact that a "Son," qua Son, has the same nature as his Father, but is personally subordinate<sup>3</sup> to Him as to seniority; or, alternatively, arguing upon scientific lines that Rational Speech or Logos is identical in essence with the reasoning Mind, but, being its Offspring, is

<sup>1</sup> I *Apol.*, 13:60E.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 56:276E, 61:284E, 62:285E; II *Apol.*, 6:44D; cf. *Athenag.*, 10:11A—see Semisch, *Justin*.

<sup>3</sup> I *Apol.*, 13:60E, 60:93C, 32:74C; II *Apol.*, 13:51D, etc.; cf. Semisch, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 191.

consequently subject thereto. Therefore, Christ the Son and Logos has the same nature or essence as the Father, yet notwithstanding, is also subordinate, "ministering to the will of the Maker of all things,"<sup>1</sup> being subject to Him on account of generation.

### THE SON'S SUBORDINATION DEFINED

What then, is the nature of this Subordination of the Son, and how does it admit of the maintenance of the Son's real Divinity? Semisch<sup>2</sup> believes that the Son's Subordination implies a "quantitative inequality of Being" in the Son as compared with the Father, and bases his opinion upon the fact of the derivation of the Son or Logos from the Father.<sup>3</sup> This view is true, if the Son is considered in the one case as the Logos hypostatic serving the Father in conditions of space and time, and in the other, if regarded in the limited sense as the Divine Reason in contrast to the whole Personality of the Father.

### SUBORDINATE AS TO FUNCTIONS BUT NOT AS TO ESSENCE

But if the Son is truly Divine, that is, as Justin often states, if He is actually God, His being is

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 60:283B; cf. 56:275C.

<sup>2</sup> Semisch, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 193.

<sup>3</sup> *Dial.*, 61:284A, etc.; cf. Tertull. "Pater tota substantia est, filius vero derivatio totius et portio (*ad Prax.* 9). But Tertull. was not a philosopher!

necessarily the whole Divine Essence<sup>1</sup>; indeed, if it is less than the whole, He cannot be God at all, for in the sharing or distribution of Divine Being or Essence, there is "no cutting off," but only extension.<sup>2</sup> The Godhead cannot be split into portions; in fact, Justin has expressly laid it down that "the whole Rational Being became Christ."<sup>3</sup> But when Logos operates in the world as the Father's Agent, and is found in a "place" upon the earth, then personally, economically, and officially, He is less than the Supreme God, and subordinate to Him. It is necessary, then, to distinguish between these two aspects of Deity, that is, between essential Divinity on the one hand, and Divinity in a functional, official sense on the other. When Justin asserts that "God begat a First Principle, a certain Rational Potency out of Himself,"<sup>4</sup> he is attempting to show how the Divine Essence can be conceived as entering into conditions of space and time to become a hypostasis, in order to perform personal functions. Since God, Who is Mind, generated this Being called the Son or Logos, the latter is necessarily rational, of identical

<sup>1</sup> II *Apol.*, 10:48B.

<sup>2</sup> An important philosophical principle. *Dial.*, 128:358C; cf. Tatian, 5:145C; cf. Philo, *Quod det. pot.*, 24: "For nothing divine is divided by taking away but is only extended"; also, *De Gigant.*, 6. cf. Numenius (*Eus. Prep. Evan.*, 538 d).

<sup>3</sup> II *Apol.*, 10:48B; cf. 8:46D. Other beings (e.g., angels, daemons) are able to share in divine essence in a partial sense, as man does in receiving endowment of sperma of the Spermatic Logos.

<sup>4</sup> *Dial.*, 61:284A; cf. 129:359A.

essence with the Father, and, in this sense, equally Divine with Him; but as to functions, secondary,<sup>1</sup> being produced by the Father from Himself to be His Agent in the Creative Work. Since "divine things are not severed," and therefore the generation of the Logos can involve no separation of the Divine Essence, consequently differences in personality and in the forms which Divinity assumes cannot diminish or limit the Divine Nature itself. But Justin states that, in any case, Divinity is confined to the Father and Son, "for in the Scriptures,<sup>2</sup> except Him Who made the universe and Christ," no other Being "is to be worshipped, or is called Lord and God." The Divinity herein referred to covers both the Essence of the Undivided Deity and the same Essence when extended in the form of the Intermediary Being, the Logos. Justin nowhere allows that Christ, the Logos, the Potency or First Principle, can be essentially less Divine<sup>3</sup> than the Father. The very fact that Christ can be described exactly by the expression "Son," "Logos," "First Offspring," "the Potency next after the Father"—that Being derived from the Father as reason from reason, and fire from fire, of necessity implies identity of Essence. Yet the same

<sup>1</sup> The service of philosophy in aiding the Apologist to express his thoughts with a measure of exactness and definition is shown in studies of certain terms e.g., *θεός*, *γέννημα*, *οὐσία*, *ἀρχή*, etc.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 68:293C.

<sup>3</sup> See Otto's note, 8, I *Apol.*, 10:58D—" *θεός* sine articulo et *θεῖος* idem valeant," and then instances Philo's use of these terms; cf. John, i, 1.



terms and descriptive expressions, when intended to apply to Deity in its active, extended or functional aspect, require the conclusion that the Divine Being indicated thereby is in this sense and to this extent less than, second to, and derived from, the Supreme God, and is therefore subordinate to Him—that is to say, in fine, Logos as to Essence is Divine absolutely like the Father, but secondary to Him as to personality and functions.

#### ARGUMENT BASED ON SCRIPTURE

Accepting this connotation, Justin, by the aid of allegorical interpretations of Scripture, establishes by most lengthy arguments Christ's place in the Godhead. At the base of his argument is the current philosophical conception of the Divine Transcendence. Consequently, he feels it necessary to instruct his Jewish auditors in the *Dialogue*—"You must not imagine that the Ingenerate God Himself came down, or went up, from any place. For the Ineffable Father . . . remains in His own place."<sup>1</sup> Both Jews and Christians believed that a certain Divine Being, representing the Father, appeared often to the patriarchs. Jewish opinion regarded this Being as an Angel, which Justin also allows in a restricted sense. However, he declines to admit that these "Angelic" appearances were mere local aspects<sup>2</sup> or apparitions

<sup>1</sup>*Dial.*, 127:356E; cf. 60:283B, 56:275A.

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, 128:358B.

of the Father. On the contrary, he asserts that "He Who appeared to the patriarchs severally and is called God, is different in number<sup>1</sup> from Him Who made all things, but not in will," and further he boldly claims that "we have proved from the Scriptures that this (Being) was not the Father."<sup>2</sup> Who then was He? The Philonian<sup>3</sup> interpretation had ascribed such appearances to the Divine Logos, the Oldest Angel of God. Justin is here found giving a similar explanation, in stating that "Christ (i.e., Logos) conversed with Moses in the likeness of fire from the bush,"<sup>4</sup> and that the "Logos appearing sometimes in the form of fire, or in the likeness of Angels,"<sup>5</sup> appeared also to Jacob, Isaac, Joshua, and Abraham, on many occasions.<sup>6</sup>

#### JUSTIN HOLDS SCRIPTURE AFFIRMS A FIRST AND SECOND GOD, BOTH DIVINE

But this explanation is not a mere concession in deference to current views for in the judgment of the Apologist it is soundly confirmed by Scripture. In fact, the Old Testament, as Justin shows, contains a number of passages which record the existence of a Supreme and a Secondary God, e.g., in the account of

<sup>1</sup> ἑτερος . . . ἀριθμῶ—*Dial.*, 56:276E, 277B.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 86:313B; cf. 60:283A.

<sup>3</sup> See Philo, I *Somn.*, 39, 40; *Leg. Alleg.*, III, 73.

<sup>4</sup> I *Apol.*, 62:95B.

<sup>5</sup> I *Apol.*, 63:96A.

<sup>6</sup> *Dial.*, 56:276E, 279A, 58:281C, 59:282D, 75:300D, 86:313B, 128:357E.

the three visitors to Abraham, One remained behind, that One is "the Lord Who is from the Lord in the heavens,"<sup>1</sup> and the same Being is the "God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,"<sup>2</sup> Who appeared in human form<sup>3</sup> to Jacob. And again, the expressions, "Let us make man," and "Adam has become like One of us," show that "there is a certain number of (Divine) Persons associated together, at least two."<sup>4</sup> From the above passages, Justin concludes that "it must be admitted that some other (Being) is called Lord . . . besides the Maker of all things."<sup>5</sup> There are, therefore, two Divine Beings, two Gods, two different Divine Persons in the Godhead existing in perfect moral union and identical in Essence, though both are not equally, and in all senses, God. Having established this point, he constitutes it a primary fact in his Christology.

#### SCRIPTURAL DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN THE FATHER AND SON

That the "other God" besides the Father is in a subordinate position as to his personality and functions, Justin labours to show in much detail. He is convinced that the hypothesis is scriptural.<sup>6</sup> From Scripture he learns that the "other God" is "subject<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 56:277B; cf. Philo, *de Abr.*, 23, 24, 28.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 59:282E.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 58:281E.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 62:285D.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 56:277B-C; cf. 55:274B.

<sup>6</sup> "The Spirit of Prophecy admits another God, etc."—*Dial.*, 55:274B.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 56:275C.

to " the Creator, and is called " Angel " <sup>1</sup> sometimes, " because He announces to men whatever the Creator wishes." This Being is obedient to the Father, never opposing His <sup>2</sup> will. As we have seen in the passages describing the divine Theophanies, the Logos performs many parts, and unlike the Supreme God, has local motion, even walking upon the earth and conversing with the patriarchs, " appearing shaped in such forms as the Father pleases." <sup>3</sup> Though He is First Principle of the Cosmos and God's primary executive Agent in Creation, <sup>4</sup> yet, by virtue of the fact that He is His Agent, He is subordinate to God, the " Minister of God," <sup>5</sup> for " through Him God orders all things." <sup>6</sup> He is the Father's servant even in the infliction of punishment upon the wicked cities. <sup>7</sup> His derivation from the Father by the Divine will also exhibits His secondary character. <sup>8</sup> The many names and titles attached to Him indicate His numerous servitory functions. " For He <sup>9</sup> can be called by all these names because He serves the Father's will," and " has <sup>10</sup> for His Senior, Him Who gives the names." Again, the same Logos becomes Christ, the Man, and submits to many humiliations <sup>11</sup> according to the Father's will. In fact, the Logos is

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 56:275C-D; 276D, 61:284A, etc.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 56:276E.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 128:358B.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 130.

<sup>5</sup> *Dial.*, 60:284A; cf. *Dial.*, 61:284B.

<sup>6</sup> *II Apol.*, 6:44E.

<sup>7</sup> *Dial.*, 56:279B, 58:280C, 60:283A, 126:356C.

<sup>8</sup> See p. 108.

<sup>9</sup> *Dial.*, 61:284B.

<sup>10</sup> *II Apol.*, 6:44D.

<sup>11</sup> *I Apol.*, 58:85C, see p. 157, note 2.

ever the servant of the Father in all His activities, though, at the same time, no less the Divine Son.<sup>1</sup>

7.—*Christ, the World-Power, Conqueror of Daemons, and the Saviour*

Though secondary in reference to the Father, Christ, the Logos, is first in relation to the universe, the "First Potency,"<sup>2</sup> and is invested with authority and dignity consistent with this primary position. Consequently, even the reputed mighty power of the daemons must be subject to Him. Justin's views on the daemons were coloured, probably, by the New Testament, wherein they correspond, some to good angels,<sup>3</sup> others to evil.<sup>4</sup> The latter kind of daemons Jesus drives from Himself by His Word.<sup>5</sup> Belief in intermediate beings—angels or daemons, as we have seen, was widespread. But the "Angels" of Judaism became confused with the daemons or divinities of paganism.<sup>6</sup> To Christians all the latter were evil, and potent enemies of the soul. And wherever Christianity was planted amid paganism, the same attitude was observed by Christians toward them.

<sup>1</sup> Justin's method of argument is far from orderly. The rather scattered elements in his reasoning have been treated individually. Hence the necessary repetition of some of the matter in this section.

<sup>2</sup> I *Apol.*, 32:74C.

<sup>3</sup> Matt., xviii, 10.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, xxv, 41.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, viii, 32.

<sup>6</sup> Justin regarded daemons as gods of the heathen. *Dial.*, 83:310A.

## SALVATION FROM DAEMONS

Amongst Gentile Christians salvation was regarded peculiarly as the effective deliverance from daemon power. In an early Christian writing, the *Acts of Thomas*, occurs the prayer: "May the hostile spiritual powers not see me" and "that I may pass through, O Lord, in peace," which is addressed to the "Ruler of both worlds"—Christ. "Anxiety for the preservation of the soul from evil powers which lay in wait for it on its journey to heaven was the meeting place of adherents of the pagan cults, of Mithra and Isis; the Gnostics, and both heretical and orthodox Christians."<sup>1</sup>

## CHRIST THE SAVIOUR FROM DAEMONS

Many times Christ is referred to by Justin as the Saviour from daemons. As such, He occupies a place in Christian thought as a "Saviour God" analogous in some respects to that in current pagan religion. But the Christian belief in His absolute Divinity marked Him out *par excellence*, as the Saviour from daemons. For had he not fought and conquered the powers of darkness in their own domain?<sup>2</sup> Not only after death, but in this present life, daemons were hurtful, and, writes Justin, "we continually beseech

<sup>1</sup> Pfleiderer, *Prim. Christ.*, vol. III, p. 201 (E.T.), *Dial.*, 105:332 D.

<sup>2</sup> II *Apol.*, 8:46 D; Cf. Epist. Ephesians, i, 21; Epist. Coloss., i, 16.

God by Jesus Christ to be preserved "<sup>1</sup> from them. The Apologist believes that Christ's power to overcome daemons was foretold as soon as He was born Man. He claims that this power is continually operative, and that thereby, if daemons are exorcised in His Name,<sup>2</sup> " Whose Name<sup>3</sup> every ruler dreads," they will be overcome; for, in Justin's opinion, " the hidden potency of God was in Christ . . . before Whom simply all the daemons tremble."<sup>4</sup> And after His Ascension,<sup>5</sup> they are still subject to Him. This was but a phase of that boundless authority given by the Father to the Son, His Vicegerent on earth, which extended not only over daemons, but over all political power as well.

### *Conclusion*

In conclusion, passing notice may be taken of certain aspects of Christ's Person which, while they illustrate further Justin's total conception of Christ, are more particularly connected with Soteriology. Christ is " our Teacher,"<sup>6</sup> as Justin often affectionately states, " Who taught us all things." It is in a very comprehensive sense that the Apologist designates Christ " our Teacher." For, throughout the

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 30:247C; cf. 49:269D, 30:247D., II *Apol.*, 6:45A.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 85:311B; cf. 30:247C.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, III:338B.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 49:269B; 30:247D.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 32:249E; I *Apol.*, 45:82D.

<sup>6</sup> I *Apol.*, 12, 13, 14, etc.

ages, as the Logos He had been teaching all nations, particularly the Israelites, and now in these latter days is pre-eminently The Teacher from Whom all Christians learn the perfect wisdom. He is also 'our Redeemer,' having been constituted by the Father the ransom or offering for all sinners.<sup>1</sup> Justin would seem to regard Christ's death as not so much expiation made on behalf of human sin, as a tribute paid to the powers of darkness<sup>2</sup> on behalf of sinful men. Christ's blood, the Blood of the Paschal Lamb, because it was shed in victorious conflict with the laemons, is considered as a sacrifice made on behalf of all who repent.<sup>3</sup> The chief objective of Christ's sacrifice was to render it possible for man to obtain merit for himself, the way thereto being opened up by the breaking of the former triumphant power of Satan and death, through the Resurrection of the Logos-Christ. As the Redeemer, Christ is the Bearer of the curses of the Law,<sup>4</sup> though He Himself<sup>5</sup> was not cursed by God nor by the Law. He is the Saviour,<sup>6</sup> the Eternal Priest,<sup>7</sup> the Universal<sup>8</sup> Judge. He was crucified<sup>9</sup>; He arose and ascended to heaven. He continually dispenses gifts of the Holy Spirit to Christians.<sup>10</sup> And having finished His First Advent,

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 40:259c.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 40.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 96:323c, etc.

<sup>4</sup> *Dial.*, 19:236; 113:340d.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 132:362a, etc.; I *Apol.*, 53:88a.

<sup>6</sup> *Dial.*, 86:313d; I *Apol.*, 32:74a.

<sup>7</sup> *Dial.*, 39:258a.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 90, 91.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 13:229d.

<sup>10</sup> II *Apol.*, 6:44e.



He will appear again at the Second Advent and complete His earthly service<sup>1</sup> to the Father, as Lord of heaven and earth.

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 51:271A, 86:313D, 110:336D; I *Apol.*, 32:74A.

## CHAPTER V

### THE CHRISTOLOGY OF TATIAN, THEOPHILUS AND ATHENAGORAS

SINCE the Christology of Justin has been presented with some fullness, henceforth, only those points, as a rule, in which the Christological doctrines of Tatian, Theophilus, and Athenagoras vary from Justin, will be discussed in detail.

#### *The Christology of Tatian*

##### I.—BIOGRAPHICAL

Tatian, as we learn from his *Oratio* was born in Assyria.<sup>1</sup> Some critics assume that the Apologist meant to imply that he was a Syrian, as the term "Assyria" in early Christian times was used not always with geographical definiteness; but Donaldson<sup>2</sup> considers that Tatian, however, was in the habit of employing it accurately, and means precisely what he states. Tatian was educated according to the

<sup>1</sup> Ch. 42.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. Christ. Lit.*, vol. III, p. 4, reference to Donaldson for biographical details, etc.

accepted standards of his day, and appears to have been acquainted with the learning of most of the philosophical schools. There is reason to believe that in earlier life he followed the profession of rhetoric,<sup>1</sup> and that it was with a view to greater proficiency therein that he read widely in Greek literature and philosophy, and searched into the tenets of the mystery religions. As a rhetorician he would be likely to travel to many parts of the eastern Empire, delivering lectures and incidentally receiving new impressions and information. Undoubtedly, his *Oratio* exhibits a wide acquaintance with literature, philosophy, and art, as well as with religion, all of which were the usual stock-in-trade of the profession of rhetoric. M. Puech,<sup>2</sup> in his investigations, has brought out the interesting point that this work is itself a rhetorical exercise.

#### TATIAN'S CONVERSION

But the time arrived in the moral and intellectual development of the Apologist when he tired of all pagan philosophies, having come to perceive their deficiencies, and to be convinced of their inability to convey a message satisfying to the human heart. Satiated with paganism, Tatian seems to have cast about him to find real truth. "And," as he relates, "while I was considering the serious beliefs, I

<sup>1</sup> *Oratio*, c. 35.

<sup>2</sup> *Tatien* (Paris, 1903).

happened to fall in with certain barbarian writings, older in comparison with the Greek beliefs, and more divine compared with their error."<sup>1</sup> The modest diction of the sacred Scriptures, their note of authority and profound knowledge, quite persuaded him, and "his soul being taught of God," he put his faith in the new learning<sup>2</sup> and became a Christian.

### HIS RELATIONS WITH JUSTIN

Irenaeus' statement that Tatian was a "hearer<sup>3</sup> of Justin" is supported by two references<sup>4</sup> to Justin in Tatian's *Oratio*. Tatian is charged with holding certain heretical opinions by Irenaeus, Jerome, Hippolytus and others. Of these, we may notice especially Hippolytus' assertion that "Tatian, having himself been a disciple of Justin Martyr, held opinions not like those of his teacher, but, attempting something new, said that there were some invisible Aeons, setting them forth in mythological terms like those of Valentinus."<sup>5</sup> After the death of Justin, Tatian is said to have become the head of the Encratites,<sup>6</sup> an heretical sect. That his opinions differed from average Christian teaching on some points seems proved, but

<sup>1</sup> *Oratio*, ch. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Some believe that Tatian wrote the *Oratio* to justify his conversion to Christianity. It was published, probably, about A.D. 165 (Bardenhewer, *Patrologia*, p. 58).

<sup>3</sup> *Adversus Haer.*, i, 28.

<sup>4</sup> Ch. 18 and ch. 19.

<sup>5</sup> *Haer. Refut.*, viii, 16.

<sup>6</sup> Jerome, *Comm. ad Amos*, II, 12.

that he actually taught a false doctrine of the God-head cannot be inferred conclusively from the scanty evidence at our command.

### HIS RELIGIOUS EARNESTNESS

His strong individuality seems to have predisposed him to tend in the direction of doctrinal vagaries. Though an uncompromising attitude to pagan error closed his eyes to any good in the old philosophies, his decided self-reliance<sup>1</sup> seems to have condoned his acceptance of unsound views from new teachings, when they suited his peculiar temperament.

Tatian's religious earnestness is very striking. He is, perhaps, the most thoroughly religious of the Apologists, subjecting himself to hard discipline and stern manner of life for the sake of fidelity to the elements of his faith. And it would seem equitable to conclude that whatever false opinions he may have held, he embraced them not through want of piety but from an excessive earnestness, which led him to attempt unorthodox paths in an honest hope of gaining new spiritual light.

Tatian represents God in the *Oratio* as spiritual, transcendent, and the "necessary basis"<sup>2</sup> of all

<sup>1</sup> Donaldson, *op. cit.*

<sup>2</sup> ὑπόστασις—5:145A. Donaldson translates "substance"; Westcott (Epist. to Hebrews, chap. i, 3), quotes Pseudo-Aristotle (*de Mundo*, 4) where the term means "reality." It sometimes means "essence" (οὐσία), (*L. and S. Lexicon*). As equal to essence, i.e., the real existence of a thing, in contrast to semblance or reflexion,

things. He is absolutely solitary,<sup>1</sup> and as to His nature, simple. But having determined to effect a "beginning," He uttered the Logos, by Whom alone He made the Cosmos, and continually maintains relations therewith.

### HIS DOCTRINE OF THE LOGOS

Tatian's doctrine of the Logos agrees as a whole with Justin's, though more closely, perhaps, with the version presented in the *Dialogue with Trypho*, but differs therefrom in certain original features which will be noticed in due course. M. Puech considers that the text of Chapter V of the *Oratio*, the chief Christological passage, has been altered considerably. Whether this be so or not, the meaning of certain expressions therein is undoubtedly obscure, and the order of words awkward. But Tatian's style is characteristically condensed, and to this peculiarity is due probably much of the obscurity of his statements. First, the Logos is represented as residing in the Essence of the Deity as the "Logos-Potency." Later, He emerges thence to become the Creative Agent and Dispenser of divine revelation to men.

the philosophical idea is maintained. In God are all things potentially. Hence, He is the necessary basis, substance, or essence of all things.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Philo: "Neither before the creation was anything with God, nor since the Creation of the Cosmos has anything ranked with Him."—*Leg. All.*, ii, 1.

2.—*The Relation of the Internal Logos to the Father*

Tatian states that "God was in the beginning,"<sup>1</sup> which is evidently a rendering of a passage in Genesis,<sup>2</sup> in accordance with Alexandrian interpretations. And since God is the "necessary basis" of all things, it is possible to assert that He is "in the beginning" not only as existing when creation took place, but as being "in the beginning" in a casual sense. But "The Beginning" Tatian states, "is the potency of the Logos."<sup>3</sup> That is to say, the Beginning marks the period when the Internal Logos, hitherto quiescent, assumes another character, becoming the potentiality of creation. This rational potentiality is the exact relationship which Logos, when Internal only, bears to the Father,<sup>4</sup> no activity *ad extra* yet being ascribed to Him. As the Divine Reason, He is but portion of the total Personality of God. But in distinguishing Him as the "Logos-Potency," Tatian has imparted to Him a trifle more definition, and to that extent has differentiated Him from the Father. Thus, He is the Divine Reason considered as potentially capable of acting in conditions wherein the Transcendent Father does not move, viz: in the phenomenal world which the Logos originates as the Father's Intermediary. Of course, since God is the "All," this distinction<sup>5</sup> is gained only by contrasting

<sup>1</sup> ἐν ἀρχῇ—5:145A.<sup>2</sup> Gen., i, 1.<sup>3</sup> 5:145A.<sup>4</sup> 5:145A—"With Him, by Logos-Potency, the Logos Himself who was in Him (God), subsists."<sup>5</sup> Cf. Dörner, *Pers. of Ch.*, Div. I, vol. I, p. 280.

two aspects of the Deity, wherein His Logos, in the one case, is merely identical with the self-contemplative divine Essence, and in the other, is potentially of such character that He can act in phenomenal conditions and have local motion, in fact, can "leap<sup>1</sup> forth" when God wills, in order to be the "First begotten<sup>2</sup> Work of the Father."

In this sense, and to this extent, Logos is thus objectified to the Deity, and, therefore, can be said to have "being," though it be but quasi-substantial or potential. His significance as the Internal Logos is shown further by the fact that in Him was all Creation ideally, which He expresses at the Father's will in terms of the Cosmos.

### 3.—*The Logos Hypostatic*

#### (a) *His Generation or Utterance*

Tatian ascribes the Generation of the Logos entirely to the Father's power and volition, viz.: "By the will of His (God's) simple nature Logos leaps forth."<sup>3</sup> Consequently, after the generation of Logos, the simple, undivided divine nature is said to be "shared" or "distributed"<sup>4</sup> between the two hypostases, God the Father and the Logos. But this "sharing" did not involve any severance<sup>5</sup> of, but

<sup>1</sup> προπηδᾶ—5:145A.

<sup>2</sup> 5:145A.

<sup>3</sup> 5:145A; cf. Justin, *Dial.*, 100, 326E, 327C.

<sup>4</sup> κατὰ μερισμόν.

<sup>5</sup> κατ' ἀποκοπήν.



only the distribution of, divine Essence.<sup>1</sup> Nor thereby did there result any diminution of the Father's nature, so as to render Him wholly or partly "reasonless" (ἄλογον).<sup>2</sup>

## LOGOS IN TWO ASPECTS

The Generation of Logos is viewed under two general aspects. Firstly, Logos is an effluence from God, as is set forth in the following passages: (a) "God was in the beginning, but the Beginning (ἀρχή) is the Potency of the Logos."<sup>3</sup> This ἀρχή or First Principle represents the totality of the rational energy which issued from God, the same being the efficient Cause in the Creation. And (b) when God wills, Tatian states that the Logos "leaps forth"<sup>4</sup> (προπηδᾶ), like reason from the mind, as the Stoics supposed when a word was spoken by a rational being. The expression propeda, suggests a relation between Tatian's thought and a form of current heterodoxy. Justin, it may be called to mind, in condemning the Modalists' notion of the generation of the Logos, quotes from them another form<sup>5</sup> of the same word, viz.: προπηδᾶν, used of the flashing out of a ray of light from the sun. But, except in the use of the term προπηδᾶ, and his acceptance of the metaphor signified, Tatian's thought

<sup>1</sup> 5:145B; cf. Justin, *Dial.*, 128:358c.

<sup>2</sup> 5:145B.

<sup>3</sup> 5:145B. God being the potentiality of all things, brings Tatian's doctrine near to the Alexandrian doctrine of Emanations.

<sup>4</sup> 5:145A.

<sup>5</sup> Justin, *Dial.*, 128:358B.

is not Modalistic. For his Logos "leaps forth," not to vanish like an evanescent ray of light, but to persist as a substantial Being, indeed, as God's "First-born Work." Again, (c) Logos is said to have "flowed"<sup>1</sup> from God, as Philo states his Logos did. But the "flowing" was not "in vain" (*κατὰ κενού*), for it resulted in the Hypostatic Logos. The precise meaning which Tatian attaches to the expression *κατὰ κενού* is not perfectly clear. On philosophical grounds it can indicate space devoid of the divine essence.<sup>2</sup> But it is also possible that by this phrase the Apologist intended to contrast a mere "flowing forth" of rational energy into space without result, with that effectual "flowing forth" which took substantial form in the "First-born Work." If so, the expression can bear the ordinary interpretation "in vain."

#### HYPOSTASIS OF LOGOS

The above three modes of the Generation of the Logos as an effluence from God are abstract. But the Apologist appears to be working up gradually from abstract conceptions of Logos as a mere divine, rational Effluence to a conception characterized by greater substantiality. For the indefinite Effluence has so far approached definition as to be said to have

<sup>1</sup> 5:145B.

<sup>2</sup> Possibly Tatian meant that Logos issuing from divine essence left no void in the Deity, i.e. *ἄλογον*, 5:145C.

"come into being" (*γένεσις*<sup>1</sup>), and soon we find, secondly, the Logos represented as a "generated" Being. Tatian visualizes the generated Logos as the hypostasis, "begotten<sup>2</sup> of the Father," and the Father is the "Begetter."<sup>3</sup> The Apologist's conception of what the generation of Logos involves may be inferred from the human analogy. He argues that he himself before birth "existed in the hypostasis of fleshly matter," but being born, obtained thereby a certainty of his own existence.<sup>4</sup> We have been informed above that Logos existed within the Deity "by Logos-Potency," and that God is the hypostasis of all things. But generation constituted the Logos a hypostatic Being, with capacity for external relationship and power to assert His personality. For immediately after His generation, there is ascribed to the Logos the personal creative act of the generation of the Cosmos, viz.: "the Logos, Begotten in the beginning, begat in turn our world,"<sup>5</sup> and in the passage: "the heavenly Logos, a *πνεῦμα*<sup>6</sup> which came into being from the Father . . . Who begat Him, made man . . . and became the Fabricator of Angels."

## TWO EXPLANATIONS OF GENERATION OF LOGOS

The manner of the Generation of the Logos is elucidated further by means of two philosophical metaphors, viz.: fire from fire, and reason from reason.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 5:145B.<sup>2</sup> 5:145C.<sup>3</sup> 5:145B.<sup>4</sup> Ch. 6.<sup>5</sup> 5:145C.<sup>6</sup> 7:146B.<sup>7</sup> 5:145B; cf. Justin, *Dial.*, 61:284B.

The implications of these metaphors are the same as in Justin, and have been discussed already.<sup>1</sup> But neither metaphor shows clearly and fully the relationship between God and the Logos.

#### WHEN WAS LOGOS GENERATED?

The Apologist ventures upon no precise statement as to the period in which he conceives the Generation of Logos took place. However, it cannot be inferred from his assertions that Logos became generate and hypostatic only just before Creation, for, considered as the "First Principle," as such, His existence could have no more a point of beginning as to His Essence than God's. Yet Logos, regarded as the Divine Reason eternally resident within, and identical with, the Divine Essence itself, but now generated into hypostatic Being, a beginning can be attributed to Him. In reference to the created world, the Logos is its Beginning.<sup>2</sup> He is the Pre-Existent Logos Who begat the world, and consequently, must have assumed the hypostatic state prior to the Creation, being the "First-Begotten Work"<sup>3</sup> of the Deity. As the Pre-Creational Logos, He possessed self-subsistent life, on the analogy of a fire lit from the torch.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 112, *seq.*

<sup>2</sup> 5:145B.

<sup>3</sup> 5:145A—see p. 186, notes 5 and 6. From the statement, "Logos leaps forth," Dorner argues that there is no reason why Logos should have a hypostasis only for creative work. But it is to be noted that Logos is said to have been "born," and is therefore as much a hypostasis as Logos in Justin.

(b) *His Activities*

## CREATIVE FUNCTIONS ASCRIBED TO LOGOS

The executive functions of Logos in the Creation are described more definitely, perhaps, than in Justin. Being Himself the First Principle of Creation, He "begat in turn the creation for us."<sup>1</sup> But He is also said to have "fabricated matter"<sup>2</sup> into Cosmos, while God is the "Fabricator of all things," Who "projected"<sup>3</sup> the basic matter originally. The Logos is also the Demiurge of the intelligible world, having created the Angels, and, "imitating the Father, . . . He made man,"<sup>4</sup> next in order of beings to the Angels, "an image of immortality."

He is the indispensable Intermediary of the Father, for "Him we know to be the First Principle (ἀρχήν) of the Cosmos."<sup>5</sup> But this arche was described above as the "Potency<sup>6</sup> of Logos," that is, the Cosmic Causal Principle, or the activity of the Logos, by means of which God acts *ad extra*.

Besides creative functions, Administrative powers also are ascribed to the Logos. He is the Providential Governor of the Universe, being its Master so entirely as to be capable of foreseeing the actions of even free agents, and, like the "Prophetic Spirit"<sup>7</sup> in Justin,

<sup>1</sup> 5:145C.<sup>2</sup> 5:145C.<sup>3</sup> 5:145C; cf. 12:151 B-C, προβεβλήμενη.<sup>4</sup> ἐποίησεν—7:146 B-C.<sup>5</sup> 5:145B.<sup>6</sup> 5:145A.<sup>7</sup> 7:146D.

He foretells future events. In the moral sphere, He ever prohibits wickedness, and has excluded the devil and his associates from all communion with Himself.<sup>1</sup> In general, He opposes all the daemons and their influences upon mankind.

### THE SAVIOUR

The Logos, in His capacity as the Saviour, is referred to only scantily, and even then, not by name. But one passing allusion thereto may be cited, viz. : "I, being born<sup>2</sup> again in imitation of the Logos, and having gained a grasp of the truth," etc., which is evidently a reminiscence of the Apologist's own Christian experience.

#### (c) *His Personality*

It would seem from some of the expressions attaching to the Logos, that Tatian attributes hardly true Personality to Him. This Apologist employs none of those official titles of the Logos so abundant in Justin which predicate Personality, but reserves for Him only such designations as the abstract expressions, viz. : ἀρχή, λόγος, πρωτότοκος, ἔργον, πνεῦμα.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> T., 146D.

<sup>2</sup> 5:145C.

<sup>3</sup> Referring to Logos as the "First-born Work," Dorner (*op. cit.*) considers that "since it is only God's Reason which makes the real-principle, the personality of the First-born has no significancy. It is only a traditionally accepted representation." But this statement omits other considerations.

## PERFORMS PERSONAL ACTS

Nor is Logos ever called the "Son of God," though He is said to have sprung from God the Father. However, several times the Apologist applies the term *δημιουργέιν* to Logos, which, since his usage of the term is analogous to that in the *Timaeus*, would imply the performance of personal acts. In fact, all the Cosmic activities of the Logos indicate His personal nature. And further, Tatian implies that the Logos is an independent centre of being in stating, that, when uttered, He is able to make "His choice of function"<sup>1</sup>—a function which is seen to be first to create, and later to govern, the universe both naturally and morally. Thus, His "sharing" in the Divine Nature does not eliminate personal independence, for, like the fires lit from the torch, Logos, deriving His nature from God, is a self-subsistent, individual Being. The above passage has additional interest attaching to it through its being the only instance occurring in this Apologist, so far as we are aware, in which the Logos appears to exercise volition independent of the Father.

4.—*The Subordination of the Logos*

The principle underlying the Subordination of the Logos to the Deity is indicated clearly in the statement that it is "By His (God's) simple will"<sup>2</sup> that

<sup>1</sup> 5:145B.<sup>2</sup> 5:145A.

the Logos "springs forth" to become the "First-born Work."<sup>1</sup> But also in various other passages the Logos is shown to be subject to the Divine Will, e.g., He is begotten<sup>2</sup> by the Father; in imitation of the Father He creates<sup>3</sup> man; and in entering upon creative work in general He is undoubtedly fulfilling the Father's will. In fact, the whole relationship of Logos to the Father is suggestive of the secondary position of the former.

#### HIS GENERATION IMPLIES SUBORDINATION

Again, the fact that Logos is "brought into being"<sup>4</sup> to be an individual also indicates His subordination. This aspect of Subordination Tatian illustrates by the metaphor of many fires lit from one torch. Though each of the fires be identical in essence with the blaze of the torch, and even though each be self-subsistent, the fact of their derivation from the torch constitutes them secondary thereto. Likewise the Logos, identical in essence with the Father, is subordinate in an economic sense, since He was prolated by the will and initiative of a senior Divine Person. Another, though minor, indication of the secondary divine rank of the Logos may be discerned in certain references to Christ<sup>5</sup> which presumably imply the identity of the Logos with Him.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Philo. (II *Somn.*, 38): "nor did God allow anything to come between the word and the deed . . . His Word is His deed."

<sup>2</sup> 5:145B.

<sup>3</sup> 7:146B.

<sup>4</sup> 5:145B.

<sup>5</sup> E.g., 21:159C; 13:153A.



## BUT HIS SUBORDINATION ECONOMIC

Though the Subordination of the Logos is everywhere assumed, Tatian does not express his views thereon in so explicit terms nor in so much detail as does Justin. However, sufficient is stated to establish the theory, and further, to make it clear that the secondary character of the Logos relates only to His functions and activities in the universe, and not to His essential nature.

5.—*The Logos and the Earthly Life of Christ*

The Apologist nowhere uses the names "Jesus" or "Christ," and he ignores Christ's earthly life totally except for two incidental references to the Incarnation and Passion, viz.: "We do not act as fools, nor utter idle fables, when we announce that God came into being in the form<sup>1</sup> of a man," and a passing allusion to the "suffering<sup>2</sup> God."

Perhaps, in an address to Pagans, Tatian hardly felt the need of identifying in explicit terms the Logos with Christ the Incarnate. However, his Gnostic tendencies would render him less inclined to do so. For, since we know that Tatian was "the very violent heresiarch of the Encratites"<sup>3</sup> in his latter years, and that he regarded the flesh of Christ as

<sup>1</sup> *μορφῇ*, 21:159C.

<sup>2</sup> 13:153A—see p. 156, note 3. Justin's version.

<sup>3</sup> Hieron. *Comm. in Epist. ad Gal.*; cf. "the chief of the Encratites"—Hieron., *Comm. in Amos*.

"illusory," which reveals a Docetic leaning, we, perhaps, do him no injustice in suggesting that certain of his expressions can be taken as indicating that his mind tended toward Gnostic thought much earlier.

### 6.—*Conclusion*

In conclusion, it may be stated that the Logos, as Tatian represents Him, is hardly more than a conception of the divine rational energy which became hypostatized. Tatian's Logos resembles in some aspects the Gnostic Aeon; and when Irenaeus, referring to this Apologist's later career, can record that Tatian "imagined certain invisible Aeons like those of Valentinus<sup>1</sup>" such similarity does not evoke surprise. And his neglect to identify in plain terms the Logos with the Man Jesus Christ is explained to some extent thereby.

However, on the other hand, it is only equitable to urge that it would be inconceivable that Tatian as a Christian, and formerly a companion of Justin whom he admires,<sup>2</sup> could intend Logos to stand for any other Being than Jesus Christ.

## THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THEOPHILUS

### 1.—*Biographical*

Theophilus had his place of abode, evidently, somewhere in the East, since he states that the rivers

<sup>1</sup> *Adv. Haer.*, i, 28; cf. Hippol., *Philosoph.*, viii, 16.

<sup>2</sup> Ch. 18: "the most admirable Justin."

"Euphrates and Tigris are well-known to us and border on our territory."<sup>1</sup> Apparently, his early training was pagan, but he became a Christian, as he tells us, through reading the Hebrew prophetic writings.<sup>2</sup> The fact that he attained to the position of bishop or overseer of the Church at Antioch in A.D. 169, as Eusebius relates,<sup>3</sup> being the sixth in the line, seems to imply that he was converted in early manhood.

#### LITERARY ACTIVITIES

The only literary works of this Apologist now extant are three Epistles addressed to Autolycus, the third of which is believed to have been composed about A.D. 181-182.<sup>4</sup> All three Epistles are admitted by modern criticism to be genuine. In them we have the views of Theophilus set forth on such subjects as would be interesting to a pagan wishing to inquire into the nature of Christian doctrine. These compositions differ considerably in character from the writings of Justin, for instance. They are not written in the defence of Christians as a body on behalf of whom the writer pleads before the Imperial Government, but are personal letters, the objective of which was to persuade Autolycus to accept Christianity.

<sup>1</sup> *Ad Autol.*, II, 24:101C.

<sup>2</sup> I, 14:780.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. Eccles.*, iv, 20.

<sup>4</sup> Bardenhewer, *Patrologia*.

#### ATTITUDE TO PAGAN WISDOM

Like Tatian, for example, Theophilus adopts a narrow view of heathen thought and practices, condemning the good with the bad contained in the old faiths and philosophies, going even so far as to assert that any good and true things to which utterance had been given by pagan teachers were stolen from the prophets.<sup>1</sup>

#### CHRISTIANITY CERTIFIED AS TRUE

In defending and recommending Christian doctrine, Theophilus selects as his fundamental ground the familiar opinion that the Hebrew scriptures are older and consequently, according to notions of the time, more authoritative than Greek literature. The fulfilment of many of the prophecies contained in them proved that these ancient books were divinely inspired and taught true doctrine. Christianity is also certified by fulfilled prophecy to be both true and divine. Socrates and Plato are condemned as being quite ignorant and their teaching devoid of real truth, because they were not divinely inspired. What effect these opinions had upon Autolycus it is difficult to estimate.

While the literary style of this Apologist is generally clear, and sometimes forceful, the character of his chief arguments is not always such as would seem

<sup>1</sup> I, 14; II, 37; cf. Justin; a widespread but erroneous belief.

likely to convince an unbeliever. In any case, the uncompromising condemnation of almost everything pagan must have been tactless, and may possibly have tended to alienate the sympathies of a pagan reader.

### HIS CHRISTOLOGY CHARACTERIZED

The Christological teaching of Theophilus presents fewer features of resemblance to the primitive Christian tradition than even Tatian's. The Incarnation, the Virgin Birth, the Vicarious Death, the Resurrection and Ascension, are not accorded even a passing mention. And, like Tatian, our Apologist omits to identify the Logos by name with the historical Jesus Christ, though perhaps in a partial sense this identification is effected by the quotation of the Logos passage from St. John, which is applied fully to his own Logos.<sup>1</sup> But apart from this solitary reference, no interest is evinced in Christ's earthly life.

Possibly, this lack of explicit identification of the Logos with Jesus Christ is explained on the ground that his line of argument did not lead thereto<sup>2</sup>; however, a more potent reason perhaps may be his inclination to think of Christianity rather as a system

<sup>1</sup> II, 22:100C (St. John, i, 1-3). Also a possible reference to Christ, viz.: "The Holy Word (Logos) not only teaches us not to sin in act, but not even in thought" (III, 13:125D), since Christ as Logos is Inspirer of Scripture.

<sup>2</sup> The subject matter of the *ad Autolyicum*, I, II, III, chiefly relates to the creation of the universe as described in Genesis.

of theological doctrine than as a divinely revealed way of Salvation through Jesus Christ. But in early Christian history, it is observable that the Logos doctrine is not bound up exclusively and necessarily with the historical Person of Jesus Christ, as in later centuries. This, however, is not wholly a disadvantage, inasmuch as it permits of a larger and freer emphasis being given by means of that doctrine to the inspiring fact of the reality of the Christian idea of God-manhood, the partaking of humanity in general in the Divine Logos.<sup>1</sup>

2.—*The Trinity and the Logos*

Theophilus appears to be the first Christian writer to express definitely the conception of a Triune Godhead. He states that the "three days which were prior to the luminaries are the types of the Triad<sup>2</sup> of God and His Logos and His Wisdom." This notion is based upon an allegorical interpretation of portion of the narrative of Creation in Genesis. But he does no more than to make the above statement, without attempting any explanation of the theory of the Trinity. And from the fact that all the rest of his teaching upon God and the Logos is presented without any explicit reference to the Divine "Triad," it may be inferred that the Apologist was in possession of only a rudimentary Trinitarian conception.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Pfeleiderer, *Prim. Christianity*, vol. III, p. 46.

<sup>2</sup> τύποι, εἰσὶν τῆς τριάδος—II, 15:94D.

3.—*The Relationship between the Logos and the Wisdom of God*

That Theophilus is uncertain as to the exact relationship existing between "Logos" and "Wisdom" is clear from his own assertions. First, he ascribes similar functions to both, stating that "God by His Wisdom founded the earth,"<sup>1</sup> and that "by His Logos, God made all things."<sup>2</sup> Again, they are mentioned in conjunction with each other. For instance, the Logos is the "First Principle and Wisdom"<sup>3</sup>; and God takes counsel with both Logos and Wisdom in creating man.<sup>4</sup> And further, Logos was "'belched forth' with His (God's) own Wisdom."<sup>5</sup> The Logos is therefore inclusive of, or co-ordinate with, Wisdom, being God's "Potency<sup>6</sup> and Wisdom."

## LOGOS DIFFERENTIATED FROM WISDOM

From these statements the questions then arise, Are Logos and Wisdom two separate hypostases, or is the second only an aspect of the first? While both are sprung from God, they are so far differentiated as to be called by separate designations—Wisdom being the "Offspring"<sup>7</sup> of the Father, and Logos His "First-born."<sup>8</sup> But again, they are distinguished more fully as members of the Triad. Since Wisdom

<sup>1</sup> I, 7:74B.<sup>2</sup> II, 10:88C.<sup>3</sup> II, 10:88B.<sup>7</sup> *γέννημα*—I, 3:71B.<sup>2</sup> I, 7:74A.<sup>4</sup> II, 18:96D.<sup>6</sup> II, 22:100A.<sup>8</sup> *πρωτότοκος*—II, 22:100B.

is the third member thereof, perhaps standing for the Holy Ghost, it must be therefore hypostatically distinct from Logos. However, in other passages as mentioned above, it is seen to be co-ordinated with Logos, if not quite identified with Him.

An explanation of this uncertainty may perhaps be found by a consideration of the type of thought to which Theophilus approximates. It is evident that he is giving interpretations of these divine hypostases similar to those common in the Alexandrian<sup>1</sup> philosophy wherein Logos and Wisdom are but different modes of the same divine rational Effluence, which constituted God's self-revelation to the world.

#### 4.—*The Internal Logos*

Theophilus brings out particularly the contrast between the Internal and Uttered Logos. With him each possesses a distinct individuality, and the essential features distinguishing the one from the other are clearly expressed. Instances of his graphic phraseology occur in the passages: "God having His own Logos internal in His own bowels, begat Him,"<sup>2</sup> and "He begat Him uttered."<sup>3</sup> Another

<sup>1</sup>Athenagoras calls Wisdom the *ἀπορροία* of God; same term in Book of Wisdom (7:25); cf. R. Harris, pamphlet, "Origin of Prolog. of St. John." Christ called Wisdom in N.T., e.g., 1 Cor., i, 24; Col., ii, 3; iii, 16. Philo often uses Logos and Wisdom interchangeably, e.g., *Leg. All.*, ii, 21; i, 14.

<sup>2</sup>*ἐνδιάθετον*—II, 10:88B.

<sup>3</sup>*τροφορικόν*—II, 22:100B. These two terms are used by Tertulian (*ad Prax.*, 5). Irenaeus condemns them as Gnostic (II, 28:6),



important passage is the following, viz.: "... the Logos which ever exists in the heart of God. For before anything had come into being, He had this (Being) a Counsellor, being His own Mind and understanding."<sup>1</sup> And again, in interpreting St. John's Logos-teaching, the Apologist states: "At first,<sup>2</sup> God was alone, and the Logos with Him," which agrees with his other statements. From the above it is clear that Logos does not originate by a divine act of will, as in Justin, for He is eternally in God as His Reason, similar to the views of Athenagoras. But an extract cited above seems to imply that Logos resides "in the heart of God" in a more substantial sense than as a mere faculty of the mind, or as an attribute. For He is the "Counsellor" of God, even before God had expressed Himself *ad extra*. And it would seem that to be so designated, Theophilus must have considered that Logos performed a function, which he as a theologian could not ascribe to a simple attribute or aspect of the divine Nature indistinguishable from the divine Being, but only to a personal being.<sup>3</sup> However, that the Internal Logos possessed actual hypostatic life cannot be confidently asserted. For in other passages no indication is given of the existence of a self-centred life in the Internal Logos. Still

<sup>1</sup> II, 22:100B.

<sup>2</sup> II, 22:100C.

<sup>3</sup> God takes counsel with Logos in Justin, Hermas Shepherd, and Barnabas Ep. But in those cases, it is not with Logos Internal but uttered or generated; see pp. 118, 37, 63.

Theophilus seems to imply that, if the Internal Logos does not possess a full hypostasis, He at least has a quasi-individuality, and in any case, is more than an attribute.

### 5.—*The Logos Uttered*

#### I.—THE GENERATION OR UTTERANCE OF THE LOGOS

The Logos, considered as a Divine Being Who had entered into relation with the created universe, is said to have been "generated." But this generation does not imply actual origination, for "what is brought into being<sup>1</sup> is mutable," which Divine Essence never can be. With some detail, Theophilus makes clear the distinction between generation in the sense of original creation, and generation in the sense of the projection of the eternal Essence into phenomenal existence. That is to say, he states that the Logos was generated "not in the manner of the Sons of gods born of sexual intercourse,"<sup>2</sup> for He ever exists within the heart of God from Whom he was begotten or prolated. The manner of His generation is indicated by means of several expressions, viz.: (a) "God 'begat'<sup>3</sup> Him . . . (b) 'belching' Him before

<sup>1</sup> II, 4—reading *γένετον* instead of *γεννητόν* (Otto *in loc.*); cf. *Athenag., Supplic.*, 10:10C—Logos "not as having been brought into being."

<sup>2</sup> II, 22:100B; cf. Justin, I *Apol.*, 21.

<sup>3</sup> II, 10:88B—*ἐγέννησεν, ἐξερευξάμενος*.

all things." Also (c) Logos is said to have been "produced<sup>1</sup> naturally out of God." And further, (d) He is "uttered,"<sup>2</sup>—the spoken rational Word of the Divine Mind. Here we have four conceptions of the manner of the origination of the Logos hypostatic, all of which symbolize consubstantiality of essence, viz.: being generated as a Son, belched out as an Emanation, produced like the fruit of a tree, and uttered as a spoken Word.

#### GENERATED BY GOD'S WILL

Though Theophilus does not state expressly that the generation of Logos is due to the divine volition, that God willed the utterance of Logos is to be inferred from several statements,<sup>3</sup> for no act of the Father can be impersonal, or of necessity, or automatic. And again, it is never stated that Logos of Himself alone either willed His own generation or issued irrespective of the Father. Nor is there any reason to suppose that on this point Theophilus would differ radically from the other Apologists.

<sup>1</sup> II, 22:100B—*πεφυκώς*.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*—*προφορικόν*.

<sup>3</sup> II, 22:100B. "When God willed to make the universe about which He had taken counsel, He begat Logos."

Newman, *Unadvisable Terms*, states that Theoph. knows no other genesis of Logos but a temporal one. But Theoph. states "When God willed . . . He begat Logos," i.e., prior to Creation or time; in fact, Logos is God's Agent in effecting Creation.

## THE GENERATED LOGOS IS ENTIRE DIVINE ESSENCE

Again, similarly with Justin<sup>1</sup> and Tatian,<sup>2</sup> our Apologist affirms that by the prolation of Logos "God was not emptied of Reason,<sup>3</sup> but having begotten Logos, was always conversing with His Logos." Therefore, though uttered, the Logos, as to His divine essence, remained at the same time in the Father, the eternal Mind.

## II.—THE ACTIVITIES OF THE LOGOS

### (a) *Logos the Creative Agent*

The general position is as in Justin, except that this Apologist holds the Hebrew view of Creation as against the Platonic.<sup>4</sup> Theophilus, evidently understanding the Old Testament (Septuagint) "Word"<sup>5</sup> or "Logos" as equivalent to the Logos of the Alexandrian philosophers, states that "God made all things by His own Logos."<sup>6</sup> Thus, the Logos constituted the instrument of the Father in the creative work.

The ministerial type of the functions of the Logos is indicated by the statement that God had "this Logos a Helper<sup>7</sup> in the things created by Him."

<sup>1</sup> *Dial.*, 61:284B.

<sup>2</sup> 5:145B.

<sup>3</sup> II, 22:100B; cf. "His holy Logos which was ever present with Him"—II, 10:88c.

<sup>4</sup> II, 10:88D. "He created all things out of nothing"; cf. II, 10:88c, II, 4, etc.

<sup>5</sup> E.g., Psalm 33, 6.

<sup>6</sup> I, 7:74A; II, 10:88B.

<sup>7</sup> II, 10:88c; cf. *Hermas Shep.*, *Sim.*, ix, 12:2.

With Him the Father took counsel when creating the universe by His agency.<sup>1</sup> But more important theologically and also of philosophical significance is the assertion that "by means of the First Principle the heavens came into being."<sup>2</sup> Here, on account of His instrumentality in the creative work, Logos is considered to be the First Principle of the universe. And this creative activity extends even to details.<sup>3</sup>

#### CREATION "WITHIN THE LOGOS"

Passing mention may be made in this connection of a peculiar feature which characterizes the Apologist's doctrine of creation. He teaches that "God made the heavens and the earth," not only "by means of the Logos"<sup>4</sup> but even "in His Logos,"<sup>5</sup> in Whom as the World-Idea all things resided as "thoughts" or "ideas" in the Divine Mind.

#### (b) *Logos, the Administrator of the Universe*

Without developing the notion, Theophilus describes the Logos as the World-Administrator. He is

<sup>1</sup> II, 18:96D. "God is found as if needing help, to say 'Let us make man' . . . But to no one else than to His own Logos did He say, 'Let us make.'"

<sup>2</sup> II, 13:92B; cf. Tatian, *Oratio*, 5.

<sup>3</sup> II, 13:93B. Alexandrian Platonism in the statement that God made the heavens a roof, which corresponds to the "intelligible world."—Philo, *de Mundi Opif.*, 4.

<sup>4</sup> δία τ. λόγου. Cf. Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, vi, 58.

<sup>5</sup> ἐν τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ—II, 10:88D; cf. Wisdom of Sol., ix, 1  
"O God, Who has made all things in Thy Word (Logos)."

the "First" or "governing Principle, because He rules and acts as Lord of all things fabricated by Him."<sup>1</sup> This Lordship is not confined to nature, but extends over mankind, for, having descended upon the prophets, "He spoke through them of the Creation and of all other things," and so interposed the divine will amid human affairs. In this capacity He is the Dispensator<sup>2</sup> of History.

(c) *The Logos the Saviour of Men*

Whilst administering the world as the Vicegerent of God, His activities relate Him to man's highest interests. Though God is the ultimate Source of man's Salvation, He "heals and makes alive by His own Logos and Wisdom,"<sup>3</sup> the Logos being the Intermediary Agent in conveying divine goodness to man.

(d) *The Many-named Logos*

The variety of the activities of the Logos is shown by several names and designations<sup>4</sup> which the Apologist attaches to Him. In relation to the Father exclusively, the Logos is "Counsellor" and "Helper"; and in reference to the Created Universe, He is "First Principle," the "Mind," "Reason," and "Intelligence" of God, "Wisdom," "Potency of the Highest," "Light," "Potency," "Spirit of God" and the "First-Begotten."

<sup>1</sup> II, 10:88c.

<sup>2</sup> I, 7:74A.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Justin, pp. 146, 149.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Justin, p. 138.

Most of these expressions result from the mere naming of some activity of the Logos as He manifests the Deity to the world, or co-operates with the Father in the creation. But all may be said to bear a reflex reference to the hypostatic character of the Logos.

### III.—WHEN WAS THE LOGOS GENERATED ?

The general position is as in Justin<sup>1</sup>. Theophilus states explicitly that God "begat Him . . . before all things."<sup>2</sup> The same is implied in the assertion "God had Him a Helper in the things brought into being by Him,"<sup>3</sup> and in the citation from Proverbs, viz.: "When He prepared the Heavens I (i.e., Logos) was with Him . . . arranging."<sup>4</sup> But another passage, viz.: "When<sup>5</sup> God wished to make all He had determined upon, He begat Logos, uttered, the First-born of all Creation," gives rise to the questions, Does the Apologist here mean that Logos was uttered contemporaneous with Creation? Or are we to suppose two divine acts, the generation of Logos, and the Creation of the Cosmos? It would seem that the generation of Logos was the expression of the divine will to create. And since Theophilus states elsewhere that "in His Logos"<sup>6</sup> God created the heavens and the earth, it is evident that the one divine operation involved in the prolation of the Logos included ideally

<sup>1</sup> See p. 108.

<sup>2</sup> II, 10:88B.

<sup>3</sup> II, 10:88C.

<sup>4</sup> Prov., viii, 27, cited in *Theoph.* II, 10:88D: cf. Justin, *Dial.*, 61:284B. *Athenag.* 10:11A.

<sup>5</sup> II, 22:100B.

<sup>6</sup> p. 204, note 5.

all the detailed creation. For "heaven and earth" were ideally in the Logos, and subsequently were given material form by Him as God's efficient Agent. Therefore, it may be inferred that Logos enjoyed full hypostatic life prior to the Creation. That is to say, He was generated in eternity, or at least, in a period anterior to time.

6.—*The Subordination of the Logos, and His Relation to the Father*

The theory of the Subordination of the Logos in Theophilus is based upon similar grounds to those in Justin, viz.: that He is the Son, a generated Being, having a secondary place in the Trinity, that He fulfils the Father's will as Creative Agent and World-Administrator, and that being the Logos or Reason of God, He is thus not the whole personality of God, but only His Mind, which is subject to His will.<sup>1</sup> Some of these views the Apologist prefers to state in his own peculiar phraseology. Logos is the Father's Messenger, viz.: "Whenever the Father . . . wills,<sup>2</sup> He sends Him into any place," etc., and the "Logos, assuming<sup>3</sup> the rôle of the Father, . . . went to the garden in the rôle of God." In this passage Logos is represented as being, in an economic sense, of the order of Intermediary<sup>4</sup> Beings, who, in contrast to the

<sup>1</sup> p. 190, *seq.*

<sup>2</sup> II, 22:100c.

<sup>3</sup> II, 22:100a.

<sup>4</sup> E.g., Logos of Philo, Daemons in Plutarch *et al.* Angels in Judaistic opinion.



Supreme, has local motion, and therefore on philosophical grounds is differentiated radically from the Father, the "Unmoved Mover," and constituted secondary and inferior officially, with respect to His functions.

#### LOGOS SECOND IN THE "TRIAD"

Logos is also God's "Voice,"<sup>1</sup> and as such conveys the Divine will to man, by the human instrumentality of the prophets. In this connection too, He is the Divine Revealer, God's Effulgence, Who, "shining like a lamp, lit up all things under heaven."<sup>2</sup> Consistently with His intermediary character, Logos is placed second in order in the "Triad"<sup>3</sup> or Trinity. But despite His secondary character, the relationship He bears to the Father is represented as being most intimate, for the Father is said to be "ever communing with His Logos,"<sup>4</sup> and confiding to Him His will in regard to the Creation. But it is significant that, as in Justin, all this Subordination of the Logos relates to His functional and official capacity, even as Logos Internal, and never to His essence which is always assumed to be divine.

#### VIEWS ON SUBORDINATION SUPPORTED IN SCRIPTURE

For confirmation of this theory of Subordination, which involves limitation, and distinction of the

<sup>1</sup> "What else is this Voice but the Logos of God," II, 22:100A.

<sup>2</sup> II, 13:92D; cf. Hebrews Epist., i, 3; cf. Philo, *de Confus. Ling.* 14.

<sup>3</sup> II, 15:94D.

<sup>4</sup> II, 22:100B.

Logos from the Father, the Apologist looks not only to the Old Testament and current religious philosophy, but also to the Fourth Gospel, the Logos-passages<sup>1</sup> of which he cites (being the first known Christian writer to do so), and applies to his own Logos.

7.—*The Personality of the Logos*

The Personality of the "Uttered" Logos is very distinct. Personal acts are performed by Him—possibly even when represented as the Internal<sup>2</sup> Logos, but certainly as the Logos hypostatic,<sup>3</sup> the Creative Agent and World-Administrator. And further, Personality is also implied in His being the "Son," Who is identical with the Johannine Logos, and inferentially too with Jesus Christ Incarnate.<sup>4</sup>

8.—*The Divinity of the Logos*

Being the Son of the Father, and the Logos of God, the Eternal Mind, as to essence He is identical with God, and therefore is Divine absolutely. As though to leave no doubt, Theophilus includes Him expressly in the Divine Triad<sup>5</sup> and thus declares Him to be within the Godhead. He would trace the Divinity of the Logos back to the period before His utterance

<sup>1</sup> II, 22:100C.

<sup>2</sup> As God's "Counsellor" before Creation.—II, 22:100B; see p. 200.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., God's "helper" in Creation.—II, 10:88B.

<sup>4</sup> Theophilus identifies the Johannine Logos with his own Logos.—II, 22:100C.

<sup>5</sup> II, 15:94D.

from the Father, when He was "ever within<sup>1</sup> the heart of God," being the Father's "Mind and Intelligence," the Son of God eternally. Again, though he never calls Logos "God," he accepts the New Testament statement "*θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*"<sup>2</sup> as applying to his own Logos, which, at least from the standpoint of Christian traditional teaching, settled finally the Divinity of the Logos in a personal sense.

## THE CHRISTOLOGY OF ATHENAGORAS

### I.—*Biographical*

If we accept all that Philip of Side tells us regarding Athenagoras, we must consider him a remarkable man, conspicuous in his time as scholar, writer, and controversialist. Philip states that "Athenagoras was the first leader of the academic school of Alexandria. He lectured on Christianity whilst wearing the philosopher's cloak. . . . Prior to Celsus, being eager to write against the Christians, he studied the Scriptures in order to contend more exactly, and was thus caught by the All-holy Spirit."<sup>3</sup> From an active opponent of the Church, Athenagoras became transformed into a great Christian teacher and defender of the Faith. Donaldson doubts the historical accuracy of Philip's remarks, some items of which he apparently

<sup>1</sup> II, 22:100B ; cf. "internal within his (God's) own bowels."—II, 10:88B.

<sup>2</sup> John, i, 1—cited in II, 22:100C.

<sup>3</sup> Donaldson, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 167. Also see Art., Smith and Wace, *Dicty. Christ. Biog.*

proves to be incorrect. However, even if Athenagoras had not enjoyed the honour of the presidency of the famous Alexandrian school, a perusal of his extant writings encourages the opinion that, in the matter of his mentality and learning, it is not impossible that he could have occupied a position so eminent in the scholastic world.

### HIS LITERARY WORKS

The only two works of this Apologist known to modern times, viz.: his *Supplicatio pro Christianis* (or, as it is designated in its title, *The Embassy of Athenagoras the Athenian, a philosopher and Christian*), and his treatise on *The Resurrection*, both exhibit marked literary excellence, which places them in a class by themselves as compared with other apologetic works of the age.

### HIS AUTHORSHIP

Athenagoras employs well-chosen and apt language, embracing a quite considerable vocabulary, in which is included a high proportion of technical and abstract terms. His style is consistently good, maintaining the reader's attention and conveying clearly the author's thoughts. As a controversialist, Athenagoras sets a noble example. His attitude to the opposing side is ever both tactful and respectful. From him the ancient pagan wisdom receives no unreasoning denunciation as from Tatian, for example. Although

pagan error is strongly condemned, the old teaching is accorded all the respect due to it. His studied moderation of judgment greatly contributes to the authority of his conclusions, which are reached by argumentation often clever and generally weighty and convincing. In contrast to the high-handed dogmatic attitude of Tatian and Theophilus, our Apologist first assembles his evidence,<sup>1</sup> discusses it, and then finally delivers his unbiassed judgment.

#### THE "SUPPLICATIO"

The *Supplicatio* or *Apology* was composed, so far as can be ascertained, between the years A.D. 176 and 180, possibly in A.D. 177.<sup>2</sup> It is a defence of Christians rather than of Christianity, and is far and away the best piece of literature of its type the Antonine age can boast. The charge of atheism levelled at Christians the Apologist takes up, investigates, and refutes in a most impressive manner. Incidentally in the course of his argument, he displays a masterly grasp of both the chief doctrines of Greek philosophy and the essentials of Christian theology. Of the Apologists he is undoubtedly the most competent philosopher. His fine mentality enabled him to achieve a sympathetic insight into the true meaning of the dogmas enunciated by the old masters. Despite the widespread pagan polytheism, Athenagoras finds

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Donaldson, *op. cit.*

<sup>2</sup> Bardenhewer, *Patrologia*—see Smith and Wace, *op. cit.*, Donaldson, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 114.

it possible to credit Greek philosophy in general with a knowledge of the unity of the Godhead, and to admit that as investigators of things divine, Greek philosophers<sup>1</sup> were led by the Spirit of God.

#### PHILOSOPHY AND SCRIPTURE

His philosophy is typical of the time—Eclectic, including elements from several schools, but in its main features is Platonic. Very frequently he quotes Plato, especially upon theological points. But like other Apologists, Athenagoras makes his final appeal to the ancient Prophets, as to men inspired of God, in contrast to those who were guided mainly by human reason, by means of which the latter arrived at many unsound conclusions. The great advantage which Christian doctrine enjoys over the results of human reasoning, he believes, is due to its being taught of God. For even the best of human reasoning is likely to be corrupted by the malign influence of daemons.

#### AS AN APOLOGIST

As a reply to evil accusations against Christians, the Christian's manner of life, the Apologist considers, is the most convincing, and superior to all forensic argument. Though few ordinary Christians possess the faculty of adequately setting forth the excellence

<sup>1</sup> *Supplicatio*, 7:8A. He asserts that what Greeks worshipped was not the idol but the idea of the God represented.

of their beliefs, or defending them in debate, their good deeds, he contends, sufficiently confirm their faith.<sup>1</sup>

The Christology of Athenagoras, though modified in statement by his Platonic philosophy, in general principle is similar to that of Justin. Its peculiar features will be noticed under the subsequent sections.

### HIS CONCEPTION OF GOD

Athenagoras states that Christians acknowledge "One God, uncreated, eternal, invisible, impassible, incomprehensible, illimitable, Who is apprehended only by the intellect,"<sup>2</sup> and that they "also recognize a Son of God," Who is the "Logos of the Father in idea and actuality,"<sup>3</sup> being His "Mind and Reason." Later, he enlarges further upon this description of the Deity, and adds the "Holy Ghost" as the Third hypostasis<sup>4</sup> in the Godhead. Since our inquiry centres around the Son, we notice first the Apologist's remarks upon His relationship to the Triune Godhead.

#### 2.—*The Divine Trinity and the Logos*

The Logos is given second place in the Trinity, viz.: "God the Father, God the Son, and the Holy Ghost,"<sup>5</sup> and these three hypostases composing the

<sup>1</sup> *Supplicatio*, II:11C-D; 12A.

<sup>2</sup> 10:10B. As a Platonist, Athenagoras regards God as Eternal Mind.

<sup>3</sup> 10:10C.

<sup>4</sup> 10:11A.

<sup>5</sup> 10:11A.

Triune Godhead are in essential and sympathetic union with each other. But the Godhead is One<sup>1</sup> (ὅν), a Unity which is constituted by the peculiar interrelation of the Persons composing it. If envisaged under one personality, the Godhead is "The Father." From Him the Son proceeds, Who, identically with the Father, is called "God."

#### DISTINCTION BETWEEN FATHER AND SON

How then does the Apologist avoid ditheism? And how does the "Oneness" of the whole Deity allow the Son to be designated individually "God"? Though Athenagoras supplies no plainly expressed statement, sufficient may be inferred to furnish a reply. First, from the point of view of Divine Essence, the Son is described as God's "Mind and Reason."<sup>2</sup> Therefore He is the totality of God's intelligence or thought. At the same time, consequently, all the Son's thought or rational activity are God's. Obviously then, "God" and the "Son" are identical in nature. In the other Apologists the Son is often designated the "Potency"<sup>3</sup>—the dynamic aspect of the self-contemplative life of the Father. But in Athenagoras the term "Potency" is not hypostatized. On the contrary, it is used to represent the constitutive uniting element of the Persons of the Godhead, viz.: "their potency in Union."<sup>4</sup> However, all this

<sup>1</sup> 10:10B; 6:7A; 4:5C, etc.

<sup>2</sup> δύνανσις.

<sup>2</sup> 10:10C.

<sup>4</sup> 10:11A.



potency issues ultimately from the Father, the Son, at Whose command it is, representing a peculiar channel by which it is conveyed *ad extra*. Again this Union is also characterized by the presence of the same active Spirit in both Father and Son, viz.: "Oneness<sup>1</sup> and potency of Spirit." Second, from the point of view of Personality—Father and Son are not two Gods in the sense that each is the centre of equal, separate, and rival Divinity, but having the same Essence, are severally hypostatized and differentiated as to function and seniority of Persons. Since the Son is God's Logos or Reason, then the whole divine efficiency<sup>2</sup> is subject to His direction. And since Logos is part of God's Personality, then all the potency of the Logos is necessarily the Father's also. Therefore, these two hypostases are, as to essence or being, One. The above position is maintained in the following passages: "God the Father, God the Son, and the Holy Spirit, . . . their potency in union and distinction in rank,"<sup>3</sup> and "the Son being in the Father, and the Father in the Son, in oneness and potency of Spirit,"<sup>4</sup> and again, "the communion of the Father with the Son."<sup>5</sup> There is, therefore, One Godhead, in which the Son, the second member in order of seniority and dignity, is Divine equally with the Father as to His Essence, but differs from the Father economically,

<sup>1</sup> 10:10C.

<sup>2</sup> See an interesting statement by Donaldson, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 153.

<sup>3</sup> 10:11A.

<sup>4</sup> 10:10C.

<sup>5</sup> 12:12D.

being subject to His will, as His "Thought," which is conceivably subsidiary to, though expressive of, the Personality of the Father, the Eternal Mind.

### 3.—*The Logos Internal*

Although the scientific term *ἐνδιάθετος* is not used, Athenagoras has the conception of the Son of God "Internal" in the Divine Essence. Here he points out that the Christian Son of God differs radically from the mythical gods of paganism in that He is "the *νοῦς καὶ λόγος* of the Father."<sup>1</sup> There never was a period when He was not the Son in this sense, "for from the beginning . . . He (God) had Logos in Himself, being eternally rational."<sup>2</sup> Since He is the "Mind and Reason" of the Father, of necessity He resides in God, on the analogy that mind is inherent in personality. And consequently, since God is the eternal personal Being, His Logos or Mind is likewise eternal and necessarily ever a constituent portion of His Essence. Even as Internal Logos, in a measure, He is individually distinct from the Father. For, not merely is He the Divine Reason or Mind, indistinguishable from the eternal Essence, but He possesses sufficient definiteness of Being to be recognizable as the Divine "Son of God" irrespective of His subsequent relation to the Cosmos. This may be, perhaps, but a retrospective view, a reading backwards from the notion of the personality of the

<sup>1</sup> IO:IOG.

<sup>2</sup> IO:IOD.

prolated Logos, but it is sound and more logical than Justin's. In reference to the statement that the Logos "came forth to be the Idea,"<sup>1</sup> Dorner remarks that Athenagoras "does not call the Internal Logos the Idea of the world."<sup>2</sup> This is true as regards any explicit statement. But since "Ideas" in current philosophy were God's "Thoughts," and Logos is designated the "First Product" of the Divine Mind, undoubtedly as the Internal Logos He is presumed to be ever inherent in the Divine Mind as the "Idea," while the Apologist asserts that it is this same Being which issues forth as World Idea. Therefore, whether as *νοῦς*, *λόγος* or *ἰδέα*, He is ever immanent in God, both before and after His creative and mediatorial activity.<sup>3</sup>

#### 4.—*The Logos "in Procession"*

Athenagoras teaches that, though Logos is eternally in God, being distinguished from Him as the "Son," He can be distinguished further as the Logos in phenomenal existence. In this respect the Apologist

<sup>1</sup> 10:10D.

<sup>2</sup> *Person of Ch.*, Div. I., vol. I, p. 285, E.T.

<sup>3</sup> Hagenbach (*Hist. Christ. Doct.*, vol. I, p. 164, E.T.), states that "The distinction between *ἐν ἰδέα* and *ἐν ἐνεργείᾳ* corresponds to that between *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* and *λ. προφορικός*." But it may be pointed out that this is not exactly correct. For in Athenagoras these expressions are used rather synonymously. Logos "came forth to be (both) the Idea and the Actuality of all material things." That is to say, he was not an "idea" (thought) in the Divine Mind actualized later on, but was always, from eternity, God's "Mind and Reason," the total Thought of the Divine.

describes Him as "proceeding" from God in order to enter into relation with the originally projected ὕλη as the Creative Agent of the Father. With this object in view, Athenagoras, being under no necessity to predicate an "utterance" or hypostatization of the Logos (seeing that He is already the Son, the "Mind and Reason" of the Father from all eternity), simply states "He came forth<sup>1</sup> to be the Idea." Two passages clearly express this hypothesis, viz.: "The Son of God is the Logos of the Father in Idea and Actuality,"<sup>2</sup> and "He is the First Offspring of the Father, not as having been brought into being, . . . but inasmuch as He came forth to be the Idea and Actuality of all material things."<sup>3</sup>

#### THE LOGOS PROCEEDS FROM THE FATHER

The salient features in the above extracts are the expressions "First Offspring" and "came forth." That a difference has taken place in the character of the Logos, consequent upon His procession, is clear from the application to Him of the term "Offspring" (γέννημα). In Justin this term signifies the hypostatized or generated Logos. But we have seen that in Athenagoras the Logos has no more need to be originated than the Father,<sup>4</sup> but merely "proceeds" from the Father, being from eternity the Logos;

<sup>1</sup> 10:10D—προελθών.

<sup>2</sup> 10:10C.

<sup>3</sup> 10:10C-D.

<sup>4</sup> See passage 10:10C-D, cited *supra*.

what significance, then, can this term have in Athenagoras? Doubtless, the writer's intention is to intimate that Divine Energy, having entered into existence in extension, bears now a new character consequent upon its relationship with matter, and is differentiated thereby from the eternal motionless Divinity. But, since Logos owes His existence to God, in this new rôle He can be designated legitimately the "Offspring." Logos is therefore represented as being no longer solely immanent in the Divine Essence, but as fulfilling in addition the part of an Intermediate Being—the Divine Mediator, the "First Offspring" of the Father. For immediately upon His procession, He has become the Archetypal "Idea" of the Universe (the Idea expressed by the Divine Mind, the Divine Thought in extension), which constitutes the medium by which the will of the Deity is impressed upon the primordial matter. This is the only sense in which origination can be ascribed to the Logos. Obviously, as the "Idea" or Intermediate Being, His entrance into relationship with the conditions of space and time of the generated world certainly marks the beginning of a new rôle. For an Idea (to use a Stoic illustration), if unexpressed, remains in the mind without relationship to the external world, but upon being uttered, it has entered into a new set of conditions, both as to the reasoning mind and the external world; and its utterance has constituted it the product of the mind which conceived it.

However, it is no less, though no more, an Idea than before.

LOGOS THE FIRST PRINCIPLE—*ἡ ἀρχή*

Again, Athenagoras recognizes Logos as the "First Principle" <sup>1</sup> of the Universe, a designation he finds in Proverbs. But he is too much a Platonist to state, as does Justin,<sup>2</sup> that this Principle was "generated," for itself is essentially "the Beginning." However, even a First Principle may be said to have an origination if it is viewed strictly in respect to the fact that, though itself unoriginated, its relations with the Created world as the First Principle thereof must have begun to be.

The Apologist does not venture to speculate upon the precise period at which the Logos issued from the Father. Since He "came forth" expressly for creative work, His "procession" from the Father into phenomenal existence must have occurred prior to time,<sup>3</sup> that is, in eternity, though as the Son of God He is absolutely eternal.

5.—*The Logos as Creative Agent and Divine Mediator*

Our Apologist's Platonism enables him to represent the Logos as the Creative Agent in a new light. While, in common with the other Apologists, he asserts

<sup>1</sup> Prov., viii, 22, cited in *Athenag.*, 10:11A.

<sup>2</sup> *Dial.*, 61:284A; cf. *Theoph.* II., 10:88D.

<sup>3</sup> Therefore impossible to speak of the duration of his existence as Prolated Logos before Creation.

that God, the actual Demiurge, "made all things by His Logos,"<sup>1</sup> his teaching is peculiar in describing the Logos as the "Idea of all material things,"<sup>2</sup> for "after the pattern of Him, and by His Agency were all things made."<sup>3</sup>

### CREATION IN AND THROUGH THE LOGOS

We have seen that Theophilus represented the Creation as having taken place "in the Logos."<sup>4</sup> The same notion is conceptually true in Athenagoras, for, in the Archetypal Idea, the totality of the divine Thought *ad extra*, were contained, according to Alexandrian Platonism,<sup>5</sup> all things ideally and potentially. Thence it follows that the Son, in His capacity as the Idea, representing all God's plans for creation, and coming forth to be the Creative Agent, impresses the divine determination upon the original matter which God brought into existence.

### LOGOS FULFILLS THE FATHER'S CREATIVE PURPOSE

The Logos, therefore, in this sense, is the "Actual-ity"<sup>6</sup> of the divine Mind, or the thought of God

<sup>1</sup> 4:5C, 6:7A, 10:10B, 18:17D. See Justin's conception, p. 130.

<sup>2</sup> 10:10D.

<sup>3</sup> 10:10C; cf. Ep. Col., i, 16—the "Universe created in Him . . . through Him, and for Him."

<sup>4</sup> See p. 204.

<sup>5</sup> Philo, *Migr. Abr.*—"the Idea of Ideas, according to which God made the Cosmos."

<sup>6</sup> *ἐνεργεία*.

operating in conditions of space and time. As such, He not only possesses an ideal plan of the Cosmos like an idea in the mind, but has energy and local motion to bring that plan into concrete existence, and thus to substantiate the fabric of the divine imagination. But, as Dorner<sup>1</sup> points out, it is not clear whether Athenagoras means that the world-forming divine Reason creates in Himself the idea of the world, or whether the idea of the world is eternally given in the Logos. However, in view of the statement that the Son is "Logos of the Father in Idea and Actuality," it would seem that the latter alternative is more probable. It may also be remarked that Numenius,<sup>2</sup> on the other hand, speaks of his "Demiurge" himself making the "Idea of the Cosmos." Perhaps either view is ascribable to Athenagoras. As the Archetypal Idea in Creation, possessing the potency of Actuality, Logos is constituted the Mediator of God to the world after the manner of the Philonian Logos. Thus, Logos becomes the Mediatorial Being the moment He issues from the self-contemplative life of the God-head, and, from the Creation onwards, continues in perpetual relation with the Cosmos as God's Vicegerent, the Governor and Upholder of the Universe.<sup>3</sup> But not only upon the material world does He exercise

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, Div. I, vol. I, p. 284.

<sup>2</sup> His Demiurge is the "Second God" and creative agent of the Supreme. Euseb., *Prep., Evan.* 544B.

<sup>3</sup> 10:10B. "By Whom (God) the universe was created through His Logos, and set in order and kept in being."



this controlling oversight. He is Lord also of the spiritual order which God placed under Him—"a multitude of Angels and servants whom God . . . appointed and distributed to their duties by His Logos."<sup>1</sup>

The Prolated Logos always appears as being in relation to the Cosmos, either potentially, since He proceeds from God before the Creation, or actually. But this relationship, being incidental and economical, serves to exhibit the continuous divine interest in mundane affairs.

#### 6.—*The Subordination of Logos and His Relation to the Father*

The Subordination of the Logos is exhibited in several features. As the Logos in phenomenal activity, He is derived and, therefore, secondary. His subsequent position is indicated also by the expressions "the Logos from Him,"<sup>2</sup> and "He came forth,"<sup>3</sup> though in essence He is identical with the Father. Consequently, whatever Subordination attaches to Him must relate not to His essence but to the official duties which He discharges as the Mediator.

<sup>1</sup> 10:11A.

<sup>2</sup> τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ 4:5C; 10:11A; 12:12D.

<sup>3</sup> προελθών 10:10D.

LOGOS SECOND IN RANK YET EQUAL TO FATHER IN  
BEING

As Creative Agent, "the Idea," in the sense that an Idea is subject to the mind from which it springs, He is governed by the Father's will. Though He is called occasionally "God," He is never designated the "second God," nor is His Subordination unduly emphasized. In fact, it would appear that the Apologist is rather more anxious to insist upon the equality and unity in essence of Father and Son, than the secondary character of the latter. However, both these views of Logos are represented. Thus, in stating the relations between the two divine Beings, Athenagoras maintains their identity in essence,<sup>1</sup> and their sympathetic union as Persons, but a difference in rank.<sup>2</sup> And again, the Son is the "Mind, Reason, and Wisdom of the Father."<sup>3</sup> As such, the Son is essentially "in the Father, and the Father in the Son, in oneness and potency of Spirit"<sup>4</sup> and on these grounds the Son is "known<sup>5</sup> to be inseparable from Him (God)."

While as "Logos and Nous" He is immanent in God, as "Idea of the World" He is economically

<sup>1</sup> 12:12D—"the oneness of the Son with the Father . . . the communion of the Father with the Son."

10:11A—"Their potency in union."

10:10C—"the Son is the Mind and Reason of the Father."

<sup>2</sup> 10:11A—"Their distinction in rank (order)."

<sup>3</sup> 24:26D; cf. 10:10C.

<sup>4</sup> 10:10C.

<sup>5</sup> 18:17D.

distinct from the Father, being the self-conscious, individual, Creative Agent, in dynamic relations with the Cosmos. Here we have two different sets of relations which the Logos bears to the Father, viz.: as the Internal Logos, when occupied solely with the self-contemplative life of the Deity, and as the Logos "in procession," when He relates the Creator to the Cosmos over which He presides as the continuous Mediator and Dispensator.

#### 7.—*The Divinity and the Nature of the Logos*

Athenagoras leaves no doubt as to the Divine Nature of the Logos. However, his mode of stating his views is peculiar. Unlike Justin, he does not base the Son's Divinity upon the fact of His Divine Sonship, that is, His Generation from the eternal Father, but with greater philosophical acumen, he considers that the essential ground of the Son's Divinity is in His being the "Mind and Reason of the Father."<sup>1</sup> Thereby, the Logos-Son is comprised essentially and eternally within the Deity.<sup>2</sup> The Father and the Son being One in Nature are consequently identical in essential Divinity. It is implied also that the Son's Nature is Divine when, as second member of the Trinity, He is designated "God"<sup>3</sup> together with the Father without distinction. And

<sup>1</sup> νοῦς κ. λόγος—10:10C; cf. 24:26D; cf. Plato, *Tim.*, 38C—"out of the Reason and understanding of God."

<sup>2</sup> ἀτρίτως λογικὸς—10:10D.

<sup>3</sup> "God the Father and God the Son"—10:11A.

the charge of atheism which had often been brought against Christians<sup>1</sup> is refuted on these very grounds, namely, that Christians believe in "God the Father and God the Son" His Logos, both of whom are claimed to be equally Divine. As the Logos "in procession" He is still the same in essence as before, being eternally of God and in God.

#### EMPHASIS ON PHILOSOPHICAL ASPECTS OF LOGOS

So much does Athenagoras insist upon the spiritual, abstract, metaphysical aspect of Logos that the distinctively Christological view is barely presented. Even the more concrete conception the "Son" fades readily into "Logos," "Nous," or the "Idea and Actuality." And the term Logos, even when used as equivalent to "Son,"<sup>2</sup> carries not the substantial Johannine meaning, but rather a speculative, scientific, and cosmological<sup>3</sup> value. It would seem then that Athenagoras wished to eliminate all but the spiritual and eternal significance of Logos, and to attach thereto an abstractness resembling that of the Platonic "Nous" or the "Idea of the Good." Whom then can the "Logos," the "Son of God" signify?

#### IS LOGOS THE CHRIST?

We have seen that the Gnostics and Philo regarded the Logos as a real Being which emanated from God;

<sup>1</sup> 10:11A; cf. ch. 30.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. L. Rickter, *Athenag.*, (1905).

<sup>3</sup> *υἱός, παῖς.*

also that Justin and Theophilus identified Him with the spiritual Son of God Who became incarnate in Jesus Christ. But Athenagoras, while representing the Logos as a real Being, makes no attempt to identify Him with the Man, Jesus Christ, unless there be an incidental reference to Him in the passage "Even<sup>1</sup> if a God should assume flesh according to divine dispensation, etc." Consequently, it cannot be learned from the Apology that the expressions "Logos," "Son of God," or "Idea" stand for the historical Incarnate Son in the evangelical sense. But, since he states that "Christians are led to the future life by this one thing, that they know God and His Logos,"<sup>2</sup> the high probability is that this Logos of religious philosophy is but the equivalent of Jesus Christ of the orthodox Christian faith.

<sup>1</sup> 21:21D.

<sup>2</sup> 12:12D.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

(*Limited to a selection of the works consulted.*)

### I.—ANCIENT AUTHORS

Plato (especially *Timaëus*, *Republic*, *Phaëdo*, *Philebus*, and the *Platonic Letters*), Aristotle (especially *Metaphysics*, *Nic. Ethics*, *Pseudo-Aris. de Mundo*), Philo, Strabo, Stobaeus, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, Seneca, Maximus of Tyre, Alcinous, Moderatus of Gaza (in *Simplicius' Physics*), Numenius (in *Eusebius, Prepar. Evangel.*), Apuleius of Madaura, Hermes (*Poemander*), Cornutus, Hippolytus (in *Philosoph.* and *Contra Noëtum*), Migne (*Patristic Texts*), Albinus, Sextus Empiricus, Lactantius, Tertullian, Valentinus (in *Irenaeus*), Didymus (in *Eusebius Prep. Evan.*), Proclus, Galen, Aristocles (in *Eusebius Prep. Evan.*), Nicomachus (*Theol. Arith.*), Clement of Alex. (*Strom.*), Jerome.

Sub-Apostolic writers.—Epist. of Barnabas, I and II Clement Epist., Odes of Solomon, Epist. of Ignatius, Epist. of Polycarp, Preaching of Peter, Shepherd of Hermas.

Apocrypha—Wisdom of Solomon.

The Apologists.—Justin Martyr, Tatian, Theophilus, Athenagoras, and *Epist. ad Diognetum*. (Text—Otto, Jena 1842).

## II.—MODERN AUTHORITIES

(a) *History*

- Angus, S.—*Environment of Early Christianity* (London, 1914).
- Bartlet, J. V.—*Christianity in History* (London, 1917).
- Bevan, E.—*Hellenism and Christianity* (London, 1921).
- Baur, F. C.—*Church History of First Three Centuries* (E.T. 2 vols. London, 1878-9).
- Chambers, J. D.—*Hermes Treismegistus* (text and notes, 1882).
- Dill, S.—*Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius* (London, 1904).
- Gifford's Edition of *Eusebius' Prepar. Evangel.* (London, 1917).
- Deissman.—*Light from the Ancient East* (E.T., London, 1910).
- Néander.—*Church History*.
- Pfleiderer.—*Primitive Christianity* (E.T.).
- Ramsay, W. M.—*The Church in the Roman Empire* (London, 1893).

(b) *Religion and Morality*

- Adam, J.—*Religious Teachers of Greece* (Aberdeen, 1908).
- Fairweather, W.—*Background of the Gospels* (Edinburgh, 1908); *Jesus and the Greeks* (Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1924).

- Glover, T. R.—*Conflict of History in Rom. Emp.* (London, 1909).
- Hatch, E.—*Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church* (Hibbert Lectures, London, 1890).
- Jackson, F, and Lake, K.—*Beginnings of Christianity* (Part I, London, 1920).
- Legge, F.—*Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity* (2 vols., 1915).
- Mead, G. R. S.—*Thrice-Greatest Hermes* (3 vols., London, 1906).
- Ménard.—*Hermés Trésmegiste*.
- Moore, C. H.—*Religious Thought of the Greeks*.
- Pressensé.—*Religions before Christ*.
- Parthey.—*Poemander* (text).
- Scott.—Hermes (art. in *Hastings' Encycl. of Relig. and Ethics*).

(c) *Philosophy*

- Adams.—*Republic of Plato*.
- Aall, A.—Logosidee ; Two Designations of Christ in Religious Philosophy (in *Videnskabselskabets Skrifter* II, *Hist. Filosof. Klasse*, 1900).
- Adamson.—*The Development of Greek Philosophy*.
- Benn, A. W.—*Philosophy*.
- Bigg, C.—*Christian Platonists of Alexandria* (Oxford, 1913) ; *Neoplatonism* (London, 1895).
- Bois, H.—*Les Origines de la Philosophie Jud. Alexan.*
- Bury, R. B.—Article in *Class. Review* (vol. viii).



- Bréhier.—*Les Idées Philosophiques et Relig. de Philon*.  
Bussell, F. W., Dr.—*School of Plato* (London, 1896).  
Caird, E.—*Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers* (2nd ed., Glasgow, 1904).  
Drummond, J.—*Philo Judaeus* (London, 1888).  
Eberhardt.—*Justin* (Berlin, 1878).  
Edersheim.—Philo (art. in Smith and Wace *Dicty. of Christ. Biog.*).  
Erdman.—*Philosophy* (E.T.).  
Fouillé.—*La Philosophie de Platon* (3 vols., 1889).  
Gréard.—*De la Morale de Plutarque*.  
Grote.—Intro. to *Timaeus of Plato*.  
Guthrie, K. S.—*Numenius* (London, 1917).  
Guyot.—*L'Infinité Divine*.  
Hammond.—*Psychology of Aristotle*.  
Herriot.—*Philon le Juif*.  
Hild.—*Etude sur les Démons*.  
Hind, A.—*Timaeus of Plato*.  
Inge, W. R.—Logos (art. in Hastings' *Ency. of Relig. and Ethics*).  
Kingsley, C.—*School of Alexandria*.  
Morgan, C.—*Trinity of Plato*.  
Mueller, Max.—*Theosophical and Psychological Religion*.  
Oakesmith, J.—*Plutarch* (Thesis, University of London).  
Réville, J.—*La Doctrine du Logos chez Philon et la Quatrième Evangile ; Histoire de la Doctrine de la Dété de Christ*.

- Ross, W. D.—*Psychology of Aristotle* (1923).  
Siegfried.—*Philo*.  
Soulier.—*La Doctrine du Logos chez Philon*.  
Stewart, J. A.—*The Doctrine of Ideas*.  
Taylor.—*Maximus of Tyre*.  
Ueberweg.—*Hist. of Philosophy* (E.T.).  
Vacherot.—*L'Ecole d'Alexandrie*.  
Valette.—*L'Apologie d'Apulée*.  
Walton, F. E.—*Devel. of Logos Doctrine in Greek and Hebrew Thought*.  
Windelband.—*History of Philosophy* (E.T., New York, 1905).  
Whittaker.—*Neoplatonism*.  
Zeller.—*Outlines of Hist. of Gk. Phil.* (E.T., 1895); *Pre-Socratic Phil.* (E.T., 1881); *Plato and the Older Academy* (E.T., 1876); *Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics* (E.T., 1897); *Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics* (E.T., 1883); *Hist. of Eclecticism* (E.T., 1883).

(d) *Christian Doctrine*

- Abbott, E. A.—*Justin's Use of the Fourth Gospel* (*Modern Review*, 1882).  
Archambault.—*Dialogus cum Tryphone* (text and notes).  
Aubé.—*Justin Philosophe et Martyr* (1875).  
Bardenhewer.—*Patrologia*.  
Bartlet, J. V.—II Clement Epistle (in *die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*).

- Bernard, Bp.—Odes of Solomon (in *Texts and Studies*, vol. viii, 1912).
- Bigg, C.—*Christian Origins*.
- Blunt.—*The Apologies of Justin* (1911).
- Burkitt, F. C.—Art. in *Jour. Theol. Studies*, April, 1912.
- Cunningham.—*The Epistle of Barnabas*.
- Donaldson, J.—*Hist. of Christian Literature and Doctrine* (3 vols., London, 1864).
- von Dobschutz.—*Das Kerygma Petri*.
- Dorner, J. A.—*The Doctrine of the Person of Christ* (E.T., Edinburgh).
- Drummond, J.—Justin Martyr and the Fourth Gospel (*Theol. Review*, 1877).
- de Faye.—*La Christologie des Pères Apologètes Grecs et la Philosophie Religieuse de Plutarque; L'Influence du Timée de Platon sur la Theologie de Justin* (in *Etudes de Critique et d'Histoire*).
- Gebhardt-Harnack.—*Prolegomena*.
- Granger.—Art. in *Journal Theol. Stud.* (vol. V).
- Goodrick, A. T. S.—*Epistle of Barnabas*.
- Gore, C.—*Belief in Christ* (London, 1922).
- Hagenbach.—*History of Christian Doctrine* (E.T.).
- Holland, Scott.—Justin Martyr (art. in Smith and Wace *Dicty*).
- Harnack, A.—*History of Dogma* (E.T., London, 1896) (relevant vols.); *Text und Untersuchungen*.
- Harris, J. R.—Odes of Solomon (2nd ed.); *Origin of Prologue of St. John* (pamphlet).

- Kittel.—Art. in *Jour. Theol. Stud.*, 1914.  
 Labourt.—Odes de Salomon (*Revue Biblique*, 1910).  
 Law, R.—Art. in *Hastings' Dict. of Apostolic Church*.  
 Lightfoot, J. B.—*Apostolic Fathers* (London, 1891).  
 Mackintosh.—*Person of Jesus Christ*.  
 Marshall, J. T.—Art. in *Hastings' Dict. of Bible*.  
 Newman, J. H.—Tracts (*Unadvisable Terms*).  
 Nicolas.—*Religious Doct. of Jews in Second Century B.C.*  
 Patrick.—Origen's *Contra Celsum*.  
 Pfäffisch, P.—*Justin and Plato* (1910).  
 Puech—*Tatien* (Paris).  
 Purves, J. T.—*Justin Martyr*; Logos (art. in *Ency. Relig. and Ethics*).  
 Rickter, L.—*Athenagoras*.  
 Sabatier, P.—*L'Apôtre Paul*.  
 Sanday, W.—*Christologies Ancient and Modern* (Oxford, 1910).  
 Sanday and Headlam.—*Epistle to Romans* (Edinburgh, 1907).  
 Semisch.—*Justin Martyr* (2 vols., E.T., 1840).  
 Temple, W.—*Plato and Christianity*.  
 Tixeront.—*Histoire de Dogme*.  
 Moffatt, J.—*Epistle to Hebrews* (London, 1924).  
 Westcott, B. F.—*Epistle to Hebrews* (London, 1892).

(e) *Lexicons, etc.*

- Astius.—*Lexicon Platonicum* (1836).  
 Cremer.—*New Testament Synonyms*.

Grimm.—*Lexicon of New Testament* (1886).

Hatch and Redpath.—*Concordance to the Septuagint*.

Montant.—*de Ratione qua Theologi linguam Graecorum Philosophorum suae philosophiae accommodarint*.

Moulton and Milligan.—*Lexicon of New Testament* (Part III).

Stephanus.—*Thesaurus*.

Sophocles.—*Lexicon*.

Wahl.—*Clavis Librorum Veteris Testamenti Apocryphorum Philologia* (1863).

# INDEX

## NAMES

(See also Contents)

- Abbott, E. A., 80 n.  
 Abraham, 153 n, 160, 169, 170  
 Aesculapius, 99  
 Antioch, 48  
 Apollonius of Tyana, 163  
 Archambault, 146 n  
 Aristides, 82 n  
 Arius, 109  
 Asia Minor, 47  
 Assyria, 177  
 Athenagoras—catechetical school, conversion, 210; authorship, 211; philosopher, 213; conception of God, 214; Christology, 214 f  
 Bardenheuer, 92 n, 179 n, 194 n, 212 n  
 Bartlet, J. V., 43 n, 56  
 Bernard, Bp., 42, 43 n, 47 n.  
 Blunt, 120 n, 121 n, 157 n  
 Burkitt, F. C., 44 n  
 Celsus, 31 n, 81 n, 97, 210  
 Clement of Alex., 53, 54 n, 133 n.  
 Cornutus, 106 n  
 Cunningham, 34 n  
 Daniel, 145, 149  
 David, 37, etc.  
 Deissman, 163 n  
 Diogenes, 163  
 Dobschutz von, 53  
 Donaldson, J., 61 n, 69 n, 92 n, 111 n, 122, 128, 162 n, 177, 180 n, 210, 212 n, 216 n  
 Dorner, J. A., 41 n, 42, 47 n, 63 n, 86 n, 123 n, 128, 156, 187 n, 189 n, 218, 223  
 Epictetus, 163  
 Eusebius, 166 n, 194, 223 n  
 Fairweather, W., 80 n  
 Gebhardt-Harnack, 42, 55 n  
 Gore, Bp., 32 n, 48 n  
 Hagenbach, 218 n  
 Harnack, A., 26 n, 28 n, 33, 41 n, 47 n, 55, 58, 59, 82 n, 117 n, 163 n  
 Harris, J. Rendel, 42, 44 n, 199 n  
 Hatch, E., 86 n  
 Heracleon, 53  
 Heraclitus, 134, 163  
 Hegesippus, 82 n  
 Hezekiah, 149 n  
 Hippolytus, 179, 193 n  
 Holland, Scott, 128  
 Inge, W. R., 163 n  
 Irenaeus, 179, 193, 199 n  
 Isaac, 169, 170  
 Isaiah, 58  
 Israel, 37, 148  
 Jacob, 148, 169, 170  
 Japheth, 147  
 Jerome, 179  
 Joshua, 147, 169  
 Justin Martyr—Conversion, martyrdom, 91; authorship, 92 f; moral influence, 93; relation to philosophy, 93; orthodoxy, 95; influence of heresy, 96; his objective, 107; Christology (*see* Contents)  
 Kruger, 65 n  
 Laban, 148  
 Labourt, 47 n  
 Law, R., 29 n, 32 n  
 Lightfoot, Bp., 38 n, 41 n, 47 n, 49 n, 50 n, 52 n, 55, 59 n, 65 n, 66 n  
 Marshall, J. T., 29 n  
 Moses, 37, 160  
 Moulton and Milligan, 163 n  
 Musonius, 134  
 Neander, 156  
 Newman, J. H., 120 n, 202 n  
 Noah, 147  
 Noetus, 117  
 Numerius, 166 n, 223  
 Origen, 53, 108 n, 120 n, 133 n.  
 Otto, J. C. T., 114 n, 127 f, 132 n, 167 n, 201 f  
 Patrick, J., 82 n  
 Perseus, 99  
 Pfeiderer, O., 41 n, 51 n, 53, 173 n, 197 n  
 Philip of Side, 210  
 Philo (Judaean-Alexandrian Philosophy), 31, 32, 33, 56, 66, 116, 117 n, 130 n, 133 n, 139, 140, 162, 166 n, 169, 170 n, 181 n, 203, 204 n, 207 n, 210, 222 n, 227

Plato (Platonism), 30, 31, 56, 90, 94, 97,  
110, 126, 130, 136, 140, 195, 203, 213  
214, 221, 226 n, 227  
Plutarch, 207 n  
Praxeas, 117  
Pseudo-Justin, 163 n  
Puech, 178, 181

Quadratus, 82 n

Ramsay, W. M., 38 n, 47 n  
Rickter, L., 227 n

Sabellius, 117  
Semisch, 114 n, 121, 127, 128, 156, 164 n,  
165  
Seneca, 139 n  
Shem, 147  
Simon Magus, 95, 163  
Smith and Wace, 128 n, 210 n, 212 n  
Socrates, 133, 135, 136, 195  
Soter, Bp., 55  
Strabo, 48 n  
Suetonius, 163 n

Tatian—Conversion, 178; relation with  
Justin, 179; unsound doctrine 179,  
193; authorship, 181; character, 180;  
Christology—(see Contents)  
Tertullian, 108, 120, 165 n, 199 n  
Theophilus—Conversion, bishop, author-  
ship, 194; attitude to philosophy, 195;  
Christology—(see Contents)  
Tixeront, J., 47 n, 86 n, 109

Valentinus, 50, 95, 179, 193

Westcott, Bp., 180 n

## SUBJECTS

(See also Contents)

*Acta S. Justinii*, 92  
Adoptionism, 24, 59, 101  
Advent, Second, 57, 144, 176  
Aeons, 179, 193  
Allegory (see O. Test.)  
Angel, 40, 70, 112, 118, 161, 168, 169, 171,  
172, 186, 207 n, 224  
Apology, 82, 93, 194, 212 f  
*Apology* (Plato), 94  
*Apostles, Memoirs of*, 151, 156, 158  
Archon, 70  
Ascension, 33, 69, 196

Barbarians, 133  
Basilideans, 95  
Beginning (see First Principle)  
Birth, Virgin, 151 f, 154, 155  
Blood of Christ, 39, 49, 147, 154, 175  
Body of Christ (Flesh), 35 f, 40, 48, 49,  
56 f, 59; origin of, 154 f; nature of, 156

Child, 39, 154, 227 n  
Christ—Inspirer of Script., 37, 40 f, 51, 58,  
143, 205; personal Presence, 137; two  
Natures, 36, 48 f, 52, 56, 59, 61, 105, 150,  
156; earthly Life, 64, 144, 157, 158,  
192, 196; counsellor (see Logos); Cross,  
148; Bodily appearance, 156; sinless,  
152, 158; human nature, 156 f;  
humiliation, 36, 156, 157, 171; early  
views on, 23 f; types of, 37, 147, 148;  
in O.T., 36 f, 39, 40, 54, etc.; called  
God, 40, 49, 56, 58, 70; type, anti-type,  
56 f, 60; confusion of personality, 57,  
58; higher Nature, 38, 39, 40, 44, 46,  
48, 49, 51 f, 56, 58, 60 f, 70 f, 100 f,  
182 f, 197 f, 214 f (see Covenant, Dis-  
pensator, Divinity, Incarnation, Jesus,  
Logos, Priest, Saviour, Soteriology)  
Christianity—organization, 23; as true  
philosophy, 85, 90, 178 f, 195  
Christology (see Contents, also Logos, Son  
of God, etc.)  
Church, defence of, 78  
Clement, Epist. I, 39 f, 142 n  
Covenant, New, 145 f, 149  
Creation, 36, 39, 68, 70, 118, 125, 126, 129,  
130 f, 188 f, 203, 221 f; within the  
Logos, 204, 207, 222; after Idea of  
Logos, 222  
Creative Agent, 36, 61, 70, 71, 72, 123,  
130 f, 143, 166, 171, 186, 188 f, 191, 203,  
207, 219, 221 f  
Creator (God, Father), 68, 70, 118, 130,  
161  
Crucifixion, 156  
Cynics, 94

Daemons, 30, 99, 100, 133, 134, 135, 138,  
159, 172 f, 207 n, 213  
Demiurge, 30, 188, 222, 223  
Dispensation, 71, 140, 144; Redemptional,  
146 f; Gubernatorial, 149 f  
Dispensator, 72, 73, 74, 145 f, 188, 205,  
207, 223  
Divinity (Christ), 36, 37, 38, 39, 40 f, 46,  
48 f, 51 f, 54, 56, 58, 60 f, 64, 71 f, 159 f;  
essential, 166 f, 182 f, 209 f, 226 f;  
confined to Father, Son, 167; scrip-  
tural, 168; philosophical, 226 f; equal  
with Father's, 169, 216, 226 (see Second  
God, etc.)  
Doketism, 35, 37, 101, 156, 193  
Doctrine of Apologists—source of, 77, 80;  
scriptural, 103  
Doctrine, development of, 81, 107  
Doctrine, Apostolic, 24, 47, 76, 96  
Doxology, 39

Ebionism, 101, 123 n, 155  
Effluence, 46, 185, 199  
Effulgence, 40, 208  
Emanation, 109, 114, 161, 184 n, 202  
Emperors (as gods), 99, 163  
Encratites, 179, 192

- Epicureans, 94  
 Essence (Divine), 108, 109, 113, 119, 181, 191; of Logos, same as Father's, 114, 119, 128, 165, 215, 224, 225; no severance, only extension, 166 f, 180 n, 220; sharing, 183, 190; immutable, 201; totality, 113, 184, 203, 215  
 Eucharist, 148, 158  
 Fire, metaphor of, 113, 186, 191  
 Flesh of Christ (*see* Body of Christ)  
 Faith, 85  
 Generation (of Logos)—ineffable, 69, 102; scriptural, 103; nature of, 108 f; manner of, 110 f, 112 f, 186, 201 f, 218; by Father's Will, 114, 183, 191, 202, 219; intelligible, 112; only-begotten, 115 n; by "procession," 115, 218 f; when? 120 f, 187, 206, 221; miraculous, 153; from above, 154; without severance of Essence, 166 f, 180 n, 220; leaps forth, 184; flowed, 185; came into being, 186, 191; belched forth, 201; produced, uttered, 201, 202; projected, 115, 122; Idea and Actuality, 219, 220; implies Subordination, 191  
 Generation, eternal, 108, 120, 123  
 Gentiles, 159  
 Gnosticism, 35, 37, 50 f, 53, 54, 77 f, 173, 199 n, 227  
 God—Conception of, 31, 53, 67, 83 f, 140, 180 f, 197, 214; His Thought, 46, 204; as Mind, 111 f, 119 f, 166, 207, 214; as a term, 71, 160 f, 162; plurality, 160, 162, 170, 183; names of, 139 f, 171; nameless, 84, 140; Supreme, 166, 171; necessary Basis, 180, 182; First and Second, 169; unity of, 139, 215, 216; relations with Son, 115; identified with Son, 37, 40; distinct from Son, 103, 118, 170 f, 215 (*see* Transcendence, Creator, Trinity)  
 God, Second, 70, 71, 110, 160-4, 168 f, 208, 214, 217, 225  
 Governor (*see* Dispensator)  
*Hebrews*, Gospel of, 24  
 Hellenism, 30, 32, 33  
 Hermes, 99, 106  
 Heterodoxy (Heresy), 77, 95, 96, 155, 179, 192  
 High Priest, 39, 138, 148  
 History, philosophy of, 134  
 Hypostasis, 109, 112, 113, 166, 183, 185, 186, 190, 200, 214, 216, 219  
 Incarnation (Manhood), 37, 51, 52, 57, 74, 99, 105, 110, 116, 143, 150 f, 171, 192, 228; prophesied, 151; based on O.T., 152 f; by God's Will, 154; real, 64, 156, 158  
 Intermediary (Mediator), 48, 74, 82, 85, 130, 131, 140, 167, 182, 205, 207, 220, 223  
 Jesus Christ, 68, 146, 192, 196, 197, 227; identified with Logos, 116 (*see* Logos)  
 John, St. (Johannine), 35, 44, 50, 52, 64, 67, 80, 106, 116, 200, 209, etc.  
 Judaism (Jews), 23, 28 f, 142, 144, 160, 168  
 Judaeo-Alex. philosophy (*see* Philo)  
 Judge, 175  
 Kenosis, 157  
 King, 149  
 Law, Mosaic, 29, 146 f, 175  
 Law, New, 146, 149  
 Logos Doctrine, 28, 41, 46, 49 f, 51, 53 f, 63, 64, 69, 70, 73 f, 101, 104 f, 181, 197, 200; source of, 80 f, 107; advantages of, 86; in reference to O.T., 88, 99, etc.  
 Logos (Son of God), 100 f; significance of, 104; First-begotten, 110, 141, 161; second rank, 110, 160-4; called God, 71, 112, 160, 226; nature of, 112, 215, 226; not a creature, 114; metaphysical, 111, 116, 117, 159, 227; distinct from Father, 71, 118, 182 f, 197 f, 215; Divine Mind, 113, 119, 207, 215; with Father, 121 f; Spermatic, 107, 131 f, 145; seed of, 132, 133; Inspirer of ages, 135, 140; Inspirer of Script. (*see* Christ); Many-named, 138, 171, 189, 205; Source of Truth, 133, Virgin Birth, 151 f, 154; Another God, 160 f; Internal, 182 f, 199, 217; communes with Father, 124 f, 208; two aspects of, 184, 226; First-born Work, 185, 191; subject to Father's Will, 191; uttered, 199 f, 202; Counsellor, 36, 61, 63, 125 f, 200, 207; Administrator, 204; Messenger, 207; Voice, 208; Is Logos Christ? 227; Mind, Reason, 200, 215, 217; Idea, Actuality, 219 f, 222 f; identified with St. John's Logos, 209; in "Procession," 115, 218-20, 226 (*see* Creative Agent, Dispensator, Saviour, Revealer, Mediator, Incarnation, Potency, Intermediary, First Principle, Generation, Hypostasis, Pre-existence, Wisdom, Offspring, Divinity, Essence, Subordination, etc.)  
 Lord, 37, 130, 167; of Hosts, 149  
 Magic, 98, 102  
 Marcians, 95  
 Mediator (*see* Intermediary)  
*Memoirs of Apostles*, 151, 156, 158  
 Messiah, 23, 30, 32, 45, 46, 60, 145  
 Mind, Eternal, 113, 119, 164, 207, 215 (*see* Reason, Logos, God)  
 Modalism, 103, 117, 184  
 Monotheism, 163, 164  
 Montanism, 86  
 Mysticism, 46, 49, 67  
 Offspring (Logos), 106, 112, 115, 118, 122, 124, 140 f, 144, 151 f, 161, 164, 198, 219, etc.



- Old Testament and Allegory, 35 f, 87 f, 164; spoken by Logos, 142 f; fulfilled, 195, etc.
- Orthodoxy, 79, 95
- Paganism, 96; contrasted with Christian, 97, 99, 178; anticipation of Christ, 106, 135
- Pantheism, 163
- Passible, 49
- Patriarchs, 49, 152, 169, 171
- Patristic, 69
- Pauline Views, 24, 42, 116 n
- Peripatetic, 90
- Persons, Divine, 170 f
- Personality (of Logos), 36, 40, 42, 51, 52, 54, 55, 103, 109, 114, 116 f, 150, 158, 182, 185, 189 f, 200, 203, 209, 226; confusion of, 36, 56, 57, 58, 60, 69, 117; confusion with Wisdom, 198; begins at Generation, 119 f; before Incarnation, 124 f, 182 f, 185 f, 189 f, 200 f, 207, 209, 216; compared with God's, 216
- Philosophy, 31, 43, 48 n, 53, 66, 82; effect on Faith, 85, 93 f, 97, 104, 107, 178, 195, 204, 212 f; true philosophy, 85, 90, 195
- Platonism (*see* Plato)
- Potency, rational, 54, 84 f, 103, 110, 112, 113 f, 117, 129 f, 130 f, 137, 150, 154, 166 f, 181, 182, 184, 186, 188, 198, 215
- Pneumatic views, 25-7, 43, 45, 53, 56, 59, 64
- Pre-Existence, 28 f, 31 f, 36 f, 38 f, 40 f, 45, 48 f, 51, 52, 54 f, 57, 59 f, 64, 70, 72, 101 f, 105 f, 108, 111, 116, 118 f, 121 f, 123 f, 134 f, 140 f, 145 f, 149 f, 187 f, 200 f, 207, 217-23
- Priest, High, 39, 130, 138, 148, 175; everlasting, 52, 149
- Principle, First (Beginning), 103, 111 f, 116, 130, 131, 138, 147 n, 166, 171, 182, 184, 187, 188, 198; as Creator, 131, 188, 204, 221; not generated, 187, 200, 221; whole rational, 156
- "Procession" of Logos (*see* Logos)
- Prophecy, 54, 58, 68, 88, 103, 133, 140 f, 152, 158, 213 (*see* O. Test.)
- Pythagorean, 90
- Reason, Divine (Logos), 51, 106, 109, 111, 112, 123, 129, 150, 153, 164, 187, 200, 207, 215, 217, 219 f, 225 f; whole, 166, 182, 184
- Reason, metaphor of, 111, 112 f, 119, 129, 164, 186, 220
- Reason, Right, 137 f
- Redeemer (Redemption), 60, 68, 69, 73, 82, 146 f, 175
- Resurrection, 175, 196
- Revealer, 68, 73, 105 f
- Salvation, 60, 70, 73
- Saturnalian, 95, 173
- Saviour, 69, 73, 145, 173, 189, 205
- "Silence" of God, 50
- Sin, original, 152
- Slave, 60 f, 148
- Son of God, 36, 37, 55, 60, 61 f, 81, 83, 95 f, 98, 100 f, 110, 112 f, 118, 120, 131, 140 f, 150, 151, 159, 161, 163 f, 170 f, 190, 210, 214, 216, 217, 219, 223 f; confused with Father, 117; pagan objections to, 96 f; pagan resemblances to, 98 f; sinless, 152 f; by Father's will, 152 (*see* Logos, Son, etc.)
- "Son," 61, 153; as basic term, 100 f; character of, 102; true, unique, 102; scriptural, 103; distinct from Father, 103, 160 f, 168 f, 217; not a creature, 109; identical with God, 164, 215, 225 (*see* Son of God)
- Sons of gods, 99, 151, 210, 217
- Soteriology, 68, 81, 174
- Spirit (Pneuma), 24, 44, 48, 51, 55, 56, 59 f, 61, 104, 143, 186, 213, 216; prophetic, 188
- Spirit, Holy, 24, 41, 60 f, 175, 199, 210, 214, 216
- Stoicism, 46, 90, 94, 111, 119, 129, 132, 134, 139, 184, 220
- Sub-Apostolic, 34 f, 106, 159; summary, 63
- Subordination, 71, 164 f, 190 f, 207 f, 224; official, economic, 165, 190, 191, 203, 208, 224 f; scriptural, 168 f, 208
- Tabernacle, 29
- Tests and Studies*, 42 n
- Theophanies, 171 f
- Thomas, Acts of*, 173
- Timaean*, 30, 94, 190
- Transcendence, 101, 168, 182, 208, 220
- Trinity, Holy, 43, 111, 207, 208, 214; Triad, 197, 208; unity of, 216
- Wisdom of God, 63, 106, 112, 198; hypostasis, 199; in N. Test., 199 n
- Wisdom, Book of*, 45 n, 46, 204 n
- Word of God, 45, 46, 51, 53, 55, 106, 203; rational, 111 (*see* Logos)
- Zeus, sons of, 99, 151







UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



128 129

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY